

MASSACHUSETTS

Harold A. Harrington, Graniteville.
 Edmund C. Tyler, Great Barrington.
 George L. Magner, Hingham.
 John F. Mack, Housatonic.
 Carl E. Brown, Lunenburg.
 Alice E. Roberts, Nantucket.
 Peter Victor Casavant, Natick.
 Annie E. Gallagher, North Wilmington.
 Dennis P. Sweeney, Pittsfield.
 Katharine F. Rafferty, Rowley.
 John F. Flinn, Stoughton.
 Frank J. Lucey, Wenham.
 James F. Healy, Worcester.

MICHIGAN

Mabel A. Amspoker, Ashley.
 Francis W. Jewell, Elberta.
 Natalie G. Marker, Elk Rapids.
 David G. Bernard, Hale.
 Samuel B. Pizer, Harrisville.
 Etta V. Schram, Lincoln.
 Edgar S. Allen, Mancelona.
 Thomas Edward Shine, Port Austin.
 Archie M. Stinchcomb, Sunfield.
 Edward N. Moroney, Trenton.
 Michael A. Maher, Vermontville.

MISSOURI

Bernice F. Degginger, Albany.
 Thomas Wert Gwaltney, Charleston.
 Charles Gentry, Houston.
 Leslie L. Travis, Joplin.
 Myrtle P. Chastain, Koshkonong.
 Gerald R. Cooper, Laredo.
 Sam G. Downing, Malden.
 Marion W. Stauffer, Maryville.
 Pleas M. Malcolm, Sikeston.
 Edith E. Highfill, Thayer.
 Summerfield Jones, West Plains.

NEBRASKA

Ralph L. Ferris, Boelus.
 John L. Delong, Bushnell.
 William E. McCaulley, Chappell.
 Harold Hald, Dannebrog.
 Cecil Brundige, Litchfield.
 James A. Dunlay, Orleans.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Vincent P. Brine, Amherst.

NEW JERSEY

S. Russell Hunt, Delanco.
 Leroy Jeffries, Ocean City.
 Edward R. Smith, Pitman.
 Martin F. Gettings, Rahway.
 Alexander W. McNeill, Ridgewood.

NEW MEXICO

Elsie L. Wells, Deming.

NEW YORK

Freida L. Brickner, Bolton Landing.
 George W. Caldwell, Lake George.
 Earl F. Sebald, Lake Luzerne.

NORTH CAROLINA

Willie S. Hogan, Chapel Hill.
 John W. Mosteller, Cherryville.
 Henry A. McNeely, China Grove.
 Robert H. Edwards, Goldsboro.
 Robert G. Creech, La Grange.
 Luther M. Carlton, Roxboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Herman A. Borcharding, New England.

OHIO

Florent G. Orr, Basil.
 Clarence T. Zwickel, Bremen.
 Worthy A. Circle, Springfield.

OKLAHOMA

Helen A. Coulter, Wakita.
 Robert D. Taylor, Webb City.

OREGON

Viva R. Todd, Cloverdale.
 George E. Travis, St. Benedict.
 Harry M. Stewart, Springfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

Emma V. Brown, Avella.
 Howard Walter Stough, Grapeville.
 Robert E. Holland, Kane.
 William E. Rutter, Kinzers.
 John K. Newcomer, McClellandtown.
 Edward F. Januszewski, Monessen.
 Stanley B. Janowski, Nanticoke.
 Sara S. Broadbelt, Newtown Square.
 Vera C. Remaley, Penn.
 Karl Smith, Sharpsville.
 Catherine V. Lybarger, Vintondale.
 George J. Moses, West Chester.

PUERTO RICO

Juan Aparicio Rivera, Adjuntas.
 Alfredo F. Irizarry, Cabo Rojo.
 Francisco R. Fernandez, Guayama.
 Eduvigis de la Rosa, Isabela.
 Ricardo Mendez, Jr., Lares.
 Antonio Godinez, Rio Piedras.

TENNESSEE

Mary Amelia Slack Copenhaver, Bristol.
 Miss Willie Ozelle Barnes, Cowan.
 Nell I. Griffith, Vonore.

TEXAS

Richard T. Rieger, Decatur.
 Earl D. Massey, Killeen.
 Mary A. Hogan, Pharr.

WISCONSIN

Grant E. Denison, Carrollville.
 John T. Murphy, Delavan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and Eternal God, with bowed heads and uncovered hearts we come into Thy presence. We thank Thee for the revelation which Thou hast made of Thyself as a prayer-answering God, and that our ceaseless needs do not exhaust Thy patience.

We pray that we may be more sensitive to Thee and the great spiritual realities, for Thou art the light of the hearts that know Thee, the life of the souls that love Thee, and the strength of the minds that seek Thee; from whom to turn away is to fall, but in whom to abide is to stand fast forever.

Wilt Thou also make us more tender in our relationship to our fellow men. Fill us with a capacity and a longing to enter, sympathetically and helpfully, into the experiences and needs of our countrymen and mankind everywhere. O God, what are we here for if not to make life less difficult for one another and so fulfill the law of Christ.

Hear our prayer for the sake of the great Burden Bearer who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of First Lt. Samuel E. Williams;
 H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Olin C. Risinger;
 H. R. 2096. An act for the relief of Lucile Snider and Cliff Snider, Jr.;
 H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.;
 H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of James McConnachie;
 H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of the estate of Harvey T. Combs;
 H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;
 H. R. 3122. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;
 H. R. 3156. An act for the relief of Anna E. Hurley;
 H. R. 3172. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Fiske Warren;
 H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of C. E. Hendrickson and the Stephenville Hospital, Stephenville, Tex.;
 H. R. 3689. An act for the relief of the Columbus Iron Works Co.;
 H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Floyd Elton;
 H. R. 3927. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;
 H. R. 3933. An act for the relief of Otho L. Curtner;
 H. R. 3962. An act for the relief of Grace Campbell;
 H. R. 4033. An act for the relief of Albert R. Rinke;
 H. R. 4062. An act for the relief of Clarendon Davis;
 H. R. 4072. An act for the relief of Emmitt Courtney;
 H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Celia Press and Bernard Press;
 H. R. 4252. An act for the relief of J. George Bense Co.;
 H. R. 4275. An act for the relief of Harry Vrontas and Theodore Vrontas;
 H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of Anton Saganey, John J. Beatty, Frederick J. Coppenrath, Joseph R. Driscoll, Edward A. Morash, and Michael L. Siderowicz;
 H. R. 4482. An act for the relief of Byron MacDonald;
 H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of William H. Radcliffe;
 H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of Francis A. Leete and Sarah Leete;
 H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Paul W. McCoy;
 H. R. 4606. An act for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co. of Toledo, Ohio;
 H. R. 4616. An act for the relief of M. F. Gubrud;
 H. R. 4725. An act for the relief of William L. Rull;
 H. R. 4726. An act for the relief of James W. Gilson;
 H. R. 4831. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Menominee General Council, members of the Menominee Advisory Council, and official delegates of the Menominee Tribe;
 H. R. 4872. An act to establish the Benjamin Harrison Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States;
 H. R. 4875. An act for the relief of Mamie Hoffman;
 H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of James M. Harwood;
 H. R. 4965. An act for the relief of J. Harry Walker;
 H. R. 5115. An act for the relief of Harry W. Lyle;
 H. R. 5259. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laver Taylor;
 H. R. 5266. An act for the relief of Mina Keil;
 H. R. 5333. An act to amend the acts granting increased compensation to civilian employees for the period July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1924;
 H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Eckendorff, and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander G. Dorr;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of certain postmasters;
 H. R. 5350. An act for the relief of Caryl Burbank, Preston A. Stanford, and Fire Association of Philadelphia;
 H. R. 5383. An act for the relief of H. A. Dixon;
 H. R. 5491. An act to pay salary of Ruth Dornsfie;
 H. R. 5557. An act for the relief of V. H. Scheuring, Elmer Eggers, and Thomas Fahey;
 H. R. 5607. An act for the relief of George A. Meffan, United States marshal, district of Idaho;
 H. R. 5698. An act for the relief of H. H. Rhyne, Jr.;
 H. R. 5704. An act to amend Private Law No. 310, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, an act for the relief of D. E. Sweinhart;
 H. R. 5803. An act for the relief of Clyde Equipment Co.;
 H. R. 5845. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of North Carolina at or near Wrightsville Beach, New Hanover County;
 H. R. 5857. An act to amend Private Act No. 286, approved June 18, 1934, entitled "An act for the relief of Carleton-Mace Engineering Corporation";
 H. R. 5894. An act for the relief of John E. Garrett;
 H. R. 5895. An act for the relief of James D. Larry, Sr.;
 H. R. 5923. An act for the relief of Simon A. Brieger, as legal representative of the estate of Thomas Gerald Brieger, a deceased minor;
 H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;
 H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of the heirs of Emma J. Hall;
 H. R. 5953. An act for the relief of Marie Heinen;
 H. R. 5998. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935;
 H. R. 6021. An act to repeal the minimum-price limitation on sale of the Akron, Ohio, old post-office building and site;
 H. R. 6037. An act to amend section 194 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L. 1088);
 H. R. 6271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior, the State of Washington, and the Great Northern Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate either a combined highway and railroad bridge or two separate bridges across the Columbia River, at or near Kettle Falls, Wash.;
 H. R. 6362. An act for the relief of Annie Bearden, Ruth Bearden, Essie Burton, Beatrice Carter, Mary Cobb, Addie Graham, Annie Grant, Sallie Harris, Minerva Holbrooks, Omie Keese, Sallie Marett, Josie McDonald, Jessie Morris, Martha O'Shields, Mae Phillips, Leila H. Roach, Belva Surret, and Shelley Turner;
 H. R. 6441. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;
 H. R. 6490. An act for the relief of W. R. Fuchs, former disbursing clerk, Department of Agriculture; J. L. Summers, former disbursing clerk; and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;
 H. R. 6491. An act for the relief of Roscoe B. Huston and Simeon F. Felarca;
 H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of John L. Hicks, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, Santa Rosa, N. Mex.;
 H. R. 6662. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Harrisburg, Pa.;
 H. R. 6728. An act for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation;
 H. R. 6805. An act for the relief of Sam E. Woods;
 H. R. 6907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River,

from the borough of Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Jenkins Township, county of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6963. An act for the relief of Buford Lee Pratt;

H. R. 7049. An act for the relief of John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes";

H. R. 7262. An act granting the consent of Congress to Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming, trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939"; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to dissolve the United States Supreme Court Building Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2448. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406);

S. 2626. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), providing for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; and

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5129. An act authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virgie B. Weaver;

H. R. 5835. An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics;

H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Jack D. Collins;

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck;

H. R. 6898. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War; and

H. R. 7132. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co.," approved May 21, 1934.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and other public purposes;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Anna H. Rosa; and

S. 2239. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair, G. F. Allen, and Earl Wooldridge.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. BARBOUR as members on the part of the Senate of the Virginia (Merriam)-Monitor Commission, under authority of House Concurrent Resolution No. 32, agreed to August 2, 1939.

H. NEWLIN MEGILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the clerk to read the following letter from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1939.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers for me which he would be authorized to sign by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests at the Clerk's desk.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Speaker be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS IN THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on more than one subject if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think if the majority leader would look at the RECORD for the last 2 or 3 weeks he would notice that it is probably the largest record we have had for a number of years. It is certainly the largest I have seen published in the 9 years I have been in Congress. If we are going to continue to increase the size of the RECORD, that is a responsibility of the majority leader and, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a pretty broad unanimous-consent request. While I realize that I have the right to object, I have been anxious to work with the majority leader whenever it has seemed proper for me to do so, but there is so much of this legislation and so many things included I just could not stand for it, Mr. Majority Leader, and that is the reason we have had to object to a lot of it. As to this unanimous-consent request I presume that many Members would like to insert things in the RECORD and as long as it pertains to Congress and the things that are transpiring in Congress, I think they should have that right, but when they go far afield and put in things that pertain to their own districts and pertain to the States, I question sometimes whether it is not a pretty broad unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual unanimous-consent request and it does not go far afield at all. It allows only those things that pertain to an explanation of what the Member wants to get in the RECORD so that it may be understood.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. If this request is granted, when will it become operative?

Mr. RAYBURN. It becomes operative immediately.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield? I make this reservation to make certain that the gentleman does not intend by this request that any Member can include in his remarks or extension of remarks quotations from any reports that are in controversy. I have in mind a matter that came up the other day in connection with some remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. If it is understood that quotations from reports of committees of Congress shall be from such reports only as have been submitted officially and printed as documents by order of the House or Congress, by law, or pursuant to the rules of the House, may be included in such extensions, I would have no objection; otherwise I would have to object. I want to make it clear I do not object to an ordinary resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. And to explain his position on any matter. That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. The request is too broad in this respect: The request submitted would permit the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to extend his remarks and to include controversial parts of a report that has not yet been signed by the members of his committee now out of existence, and there is every indication of its never being signed because of libel in it and other matters. The gentleman from Illinois did include in his remarks a few days ago under a privilege to revise and extend, but not under a privilege to extend and revise to include extraneous matter, a long column from the so-called Sabath report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Until there is a definite understanding and agreement in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels inclined to state for the benefit of all Members that this unanimous-consent request speaks for itself and it is not up to the majority leader or the Chair to interpret the question.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, until the request is amended or changed, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. CROWTHER, be permitted to extend his remarks by publishing an article by Millard E. Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE RECORD

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4108) to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Federal Security Administrator."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

GOODS PRODUCED IN STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 59, authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons, and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 59, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of furnishing information to the Congress regarding the amount of goods produced in State and Federal prisons, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor is authorized and directed to collect information concerning the amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons, showing separately the amount and value of goods produced under the State-use, State-account, contract, and piece-price systems.

For the purpose of making this study, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000. The Commissioner of Labor Statistics is directed to submit the report to the Congress on or before May 1, 1940.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, after the word "the", insert "character, kind, type."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will this entail any expense upon the part of the Federal Government?

Mrs. NORTON. There is included a small appropriation which the Secretary of Labor believes absolutely necessary in order to collect this information, which seems very important to determine the amount and value of prison-made goods in competition with industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And there is no other way of collecting this information?

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the full Committee on Labor in accord with this?

Mrs. NORTON. It is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey a question. The Central Statistical Board which was established, and of which the Secretary of Labor is a member, gathers all this data. I think the gentlewoman from New Jersey will recognize that this will be duplication of work. If it is not, will the gentlewoman state whether the Central Statistical Board is the proper set-up to get this information?

Mrs. NORTON. I simply say to the gentleman that the resolution would enable the Department of Labor to procure up-to-date information on the amount, kind, and type of goods produced in State and Federal prisons.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Central Statistical Board was set up 3 or 4 years ago by this administration to make that very inquiry, and the Secretary of Labor is a member of that Board. I do not think that the Department of Labor should go into this when we have a board already set up to find that information.

Mrs. NORTON. This is in complete accordance with the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor desires to get this bill enacted into law.

Mr. RICH. The Secretary of Labor is a member of that Board and that is where she should go to get the information. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN STATES OF IOWA AND MISSOURI

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 181, giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the States of Iowa and Missouri establishing a boundary between said States and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 181

Whereas under date of December 13, 1937, the State of Missouri commenced suit against the State of Iowa in the Supreme Court of the United States for the purpose of determining the boundary line between the county of Clark in the State of Missouri and the county of Lee in the State of Iowa; and

Whereas by stipulation filed in the said Supreme Court of the United States, it was proposed that the Legislature of Iowa and the Legislature of Missouri pass like bills, the State of Missouri waiving and relinquishing to the State of Iowa all jurisdiction to lands lying north and east of the Des Moines River, now in the county of Clark, State of Missouri, and the State of Iowa waiving

and relinquishing to the State of Missouri all lands lying south and west of the Des Moines River, and now in the county of Lee, State of Iowa, and that said acts be submitted to the Congress of the United States for its approval; and

Whereas in accordance with said stipulation, the Forty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Iowa did at such session pass such act, this act being known and designated as House File No. 651, Acts of the Forty-eighth General Assembly of Iowa, bearing the signatures of John R. Irwin, speaker of the house; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of George A. Wilson, Governor of Iowa, under date of April 18, 1939, said act being thereupon properly published and becoming law under date of April 23, 1939; and

Whereas said act provided in substance that the Des Moines River in its present course as heretofore declared by the Congress of the United States shall be and remain the true boundary line between the State of Missouri and the State of Iowa; that the State of Iowa relinquishes all jurisdiction to all lands in Lee County lying south and west of the Des Moines River, being south and east of the east and west boundary line between the States of Iowa and Missouri, and that the effective date of the relinquishment of jurisdiction shall be as of midnight of the 31st day of December following the passage of the act of Congress approving the relinquishment of jurisdiction; and

Whereas in accordance with stipulation as aforesaid, the Sixtieth General Assembly of the State of Missouri did, at such session, pass a like act, this act being known and designated as senate bill 350 of the acts of the Sixtieth General Assembly of Missouri and bearing the signature and approval of Lloyd C. Stark, Governor of Missouri, under date of June 16, 1939; and

Whereas said act provides in substance that the Des Moines River shall be the true boundary line as between Missouri and Iowa; that the State of Missouri relinquishes all jurisdiction to all lands lying north and east of the Des Moines River and that the effective date of the relinquishment of jurisdiction over the land herein described shall be as of midnight of the 31st day of December following the passage of the act of Congress approving the relinquishment of jurisdiction; and

Whereas the said acts of the States of Iowa and Missouri constitute an agreement between said States establishing a boundary between said States: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary; and said acts of the States of Iowa and Missouri are hereby approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL SERVICE IN THE ENROLLING ROOM

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 293, a resolution usually presented at this stage of the session, and ask its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 293

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives during the closing days of the present session not to exceed \$200 for additional clerical services in the enrolling room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, a few moments ago my colleague from Illinois, Mr. CHURCH, rose I think for the fourth time objecting to the extension of remarks because I might insert something from a report which, for technical reasons, has not been filed. I want to assure you I can say much more without fear of libel than the report contains, but I would like to know why he is so afraid that the report should be published. I am not afraid to publish it and people should know what the facts were.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. If the other members of the gentleman's committee are willing to sign that report, that would be

another matter; but up to the present time not one member of that committee other than yourself has been willing to sign it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is in error again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

COPIES OF HEARINGS ON THE NEUTRALITY LAW

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (H. Rept. No. 1454) favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 238) authorizing the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed additional copies of the hearings on the proposed amendments to the present neutrality law and related legislation affecting the foreign policy of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 288

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 900 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on bills and resolutions "Proposing amendments to the present neutrality law and related legislation affecting the foreign policy of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES ON THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5129) authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after "purpose", insert "Provided, however, That all new personnel in such construction work occupying skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, and supervisory positions shall be citizens of the United States."

Page 2, line 6, after "Provided", insert "further."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this amendment proceeds along the line of the Schafer and Starnes amendments, for which there was so much support in the House.

Mr. BLAND. It proceeds along the line of the Starnes amendment. The Schafer amendment would have extended it a great deal further and would have involved a very serious question on all kinds of labor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This applies to what?

Mr. BLAND. Supervisory, technical, engineering, and positions of that kind. I think it is practically the same thing as the Starnes amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it is a very good amendment and I am glad to support it.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear the request of the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. I asked unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendment, which is practically the same as the Starnes amendment, offered in the House, which provides that all new personnel in such construction work, skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, and supervisory positions shall be citizens of the United States. My understanding is that it was agreed to by the labor representatives.

Mr. SABATH. That will eliminate the objections that have been raised by the Federation of Labor?

Mr. BLAND. I think so.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have 11,000,000 unemployed people in America. Does the gentleman think that would be a good opportunity to employ a few hundred thousand of the people on relief?

Mr. BLAND. I wish it were true, but conditions are such as to housing and health facilities, and so forth, that I would be very much afraid to go farther than this at this time. I would like to do it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLAYA DE FLOR LAND & IMPROVEMENT CO.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7132) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co.," approved May 21, 1934, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after "amended" insert "Provided, That such evidence shall be subject, however, to any objection that the United States may interpose as to relevancy, materiality, or competency other than the objection of the witnesses not being produced in person."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

EPES TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1042) for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Epes Transportation Corporation, of Virginia, the sum of \$6,537.95, in full satisfaction of all claims of such corporation against the United States, such sum representing taxes (with interest and penalty) paid to the United States by such corporation on account of certain cigarettes and tobacco products which were withdrawn from bonded warehouse in Winston-Salem, N. C., by such corporation for export to foreign consignees, but which were not exported due to the fact that such cigarettes and tobacco products were stolen from the trucks of such corporation en route to the intended exportation point: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "point", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLOSER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5835) to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after "meetings", insert "within the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2654) to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims. This bill was unanimously reported out of the Judiciary Committee. It concerns claims for personal injury of employees of railroads in receivership, and provides that these claims shall be deemed operating expenses of the railroads. The bill has passed the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 77, subsection (n), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"(n) In proceedings under this section, and in equity receiverships of railroad corporations now or hereafter pending in any court of the United States, claims for personal injuries to employees of a railroad corporation, claims of personal representatives of deceased employees of a railroad corporation, arising under State or Federal laws, and claims now or hereafter payable by sureties upon supersedeas, appeal, attachment, or garnishment bonds, executed by sureties without security, for and in any action against such railroad corporation or trustees appointed pursuant to this section, brought during the period of receivership or trust shall be preferred and paid out of the assets of such railroad corporation as operating expenses of such railroad."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERM OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, AT POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7294) to provide for the establishment of terms of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, at Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That terms of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York shall be held at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., at such times, not less than once a year, as may be fixed by rule of such court.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE MAINTENANCE OF OFF-SHORE GAMBLING ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7235) to prohibit the maintenance of gambling establishments within the

admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill on which the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings. The committee is unanimously in favor of the bill. It has the support of the Department of Justice and other departments affected, and it is most important that it should be enacted as an emergency measure at this time. Am I correct?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that he is entirely correct. The Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, and the State Department have all cooperated with the Judiciary Committee in the drawing of the bill and have urgently asked its passage.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. These gambling ships, Mr. Speaker, are right in my front yard, off Santa Monica, Calif. They are defying the power of the United States Government; they are defying the power of the government of California; they are defying the Attorney General of the United States, the attorney general of California, the district attorney of Los Angeles County, the sheriff of Los Angeles County; have turned hoses on the officers and refused to let them board the ship. Many people have just recently been violently attacked and badly beaten by strong-arm men on these ships. Their jaws have been badly broken, necessitating weeks of hospitalization. Two people have been killed. I hope this House will help us by passing this bill and give to my section that measure of the protection they themselves would like to have in their respective sections or districts.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object with the understanding that under this procedure I may have the right to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would be entitled to that privilege.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Criminal Code of the United States be amended by inserting after section 287 the following section:

"SEC. 287A. Whoever, upon the high seas or on any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, shall set up or keep any common gaming or gambling establishment for the purpose of gaming or gambling, including accepting, recording, or registering bets, or carrying on a policy or any other lottery, or playing any game of chance, for money or other thing of value; or whoever shall, in pursuance of any such gambling enterprise, induce, entice, solicit, or permit any person to bet or play at any such establishment, shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of not more than 2 years or a fine in an amount not exceeding the sum of \$10,000, or both. Every vessel or floating device employed in any violation of the provisions of this section, including its tackle, apparel, furniture, equipment, and stores, shall be forfeited to the United States by proper proceedings in any court of the United States."

Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful to operate or use any vessel for the carriage or transportation, or for any part of the carriage or transportation, either directly or indirectly, of any passengers, for hire or otherwise, between any point or place within the United States and any foreign vessel on the high seas out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, Territory, or possession of the United States. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any vessel used in carrying or transporting any person to or from any foreign vessel in case of any emergency involving the safety or protection of life or property.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this act. For any violation of any of the provisions of section 2 of this act or of any rule or regulation issued thereunder, the owner and charterer of said vessel shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$200 for each passenger carried or transported, and the master or other person in charge of such vessel to a civil penalty of \$300. Such penalty shall constitute a lien on such vessel, and proceedings to enforce such lien may be brought summarily by way of libel in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to miti-

gate or remit any of the penalties provided by this section on such terms as he may deem proper.

Sec. 4. As used in this act, the word "vessel" shall include every kind of water and air craft or other contrivance used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, or on water and in the air; and the words "floating device" shall mean any ship, boat, barge, or other water craft or any structure capable of floating on the water.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof.

Sec. 6. The term "United States" as used in this act shall include the continental United States and the Territories and possessions of the United States, other than the Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "whoever", strike out the balance of line 5, all of lines 6 and 7, and the word "gaming", in line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"On any waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, or upon the high seas, on board any vessel used principally for a violation of any provision hereinafter set out and belonging in whole or in part to the United States or any citizen thereof or any corporation created by or under the law of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or District thereof, shall set up or operate any common gaming."

Page 2, beginning in line 15, after the word "both", strike out the balance of line 15 and all of lines 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Page 2, line 24, strike out the word "foreign."

Page 3, line 1, after the word "States", insert the following: "which vessel is used in violation of section 1 hereof."

Page 3, line 4, strike out the word "foreign."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] to offer an amendment.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GEYER of California: Page 1, line 4, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "sections."

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 287B. Whoever shall knowingly transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any roulette wheel, gambling outfit, loaded dice, marked cards, or any machine, apparatus, or mechanical device designed or adapted for the playing of any game of chance for money or other thing of value, or whoever shall receive, possess, or dispose of any article which has been transported in violation of this section, knowing the same to have been so transported, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both such fine and imprisonment. As used in this section the term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between any State, District, Territory, or possession of the United States and any place outside of such State, District, Territory, or possession."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane. The bill under consideration concerns the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, whereas the amendment deals with matters of interstate commerce, the transportation or carriage of so-called roulette wheels, marked dice, and other paraphernalia used in games of chance across State borders. For this reason it is not germane to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe my amendment is germane because it has to do with the same general subject dealt with by the bill, gambling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. For the reason stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] the Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RE H. R. 7235

Mr. CELLER. This bill was reported out by the Judiciary Committee unanimously. Its primary purpose is to prohibit gambling establishments within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States.

It would appear that at the present time, four ships are anchored a little more than 3 miles beyond the coast of

California, in the vicinity of Los Angeles. These ships are the *S. S. Rex*, the *S. S. Tango*, the *S. S. Showboat*, and the *S. S. Texas*. They are operated by four distinct corporations incorporated in the State of Nevada, which, apparently, is the only State in the Union that legalizes gambling. About 100 "taxi" motorboats journey to and from these ships from the wharf at Santa Monica. The gamblers in control of these ships hire these motorboats to convey patrons to said ships which are beyond the 3-mile limit, and no charge is made for such "taxi" service. These ships are maintained solely for gambling purposes. They fly the American flag. The State of California is powerless to act legally because the jurisdiction of the State is confined to 3 miles from the low-water mark. As many as 6,000 persons board each of these ships of a Saturday night, a total of 24,000. Hundreds of thousands of dollars pass hands.

California heretofore passed a statute making it a criminal offense, as I understand it, for these "taxi" boats to ply their trade. The highest court of the State declared this statute unconstitutional because the ultimate destination of these boats was beyond the 3-mile limit and, therefore, outside of the jurisdiction of the State. California now appeals to us for help.

I herewith submit a telegram addressed to the Judiciary Committee, under date of July 28, 1939, by the Attorney General of the State of California:

Your favorable consideration of gambling-ship legislation is earnestly requested. California with approximately 1,000 miles of shore line is particularly vulnerable to the activities of such ships which have no other purpose than to nullify the State laws against illegal gambling. By anchoring more than 3 miles from shore they create jurisdictional as well as practical problems of enforcement. State and local authorities are now engaged in attempting to overcome these difficulties but a Federal statute such as that proposed would automatically eliminate the source of trouble. Should you desire information concerning scope of activities or any other assistance this office will gladly comply.

EARL WARREN, Attorney General.

Federal action is necessary to put a stop to the evil practices aboard these ships.

The constitutional provisions relating to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the high seas and navigable waters are the following:

Article I, section 8:

The Congress shall have power
To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;

Article III, section 2:

The judicial power shall extend to all cases . . . of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

The territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and therefore the territorial jurisdiction of the coastal States, extends only as far as the so-called 3-mile limit.

Thus, in *Cunard Steamship Co. v. Mellon* (262 U. S. 100, 122), the Supreme Court stated:

It now is settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays, and other enclosed arms of the sea along its coast, and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league, or 3 geographic miles.

In *Murray v. Hildreth*, 61 F. (2d) 483, 484 (C. C. A. 5th), the court stated:

That part of the high seas within 3 miles of the coast of the United States is, under the law of nations, within their territorial jurisdiction.

In Jessup on the Law of Territorial Waters and Maritime Jurisdiction (p. 49), which is the leading treatise on the subject, there is found the following statement:

Like Great Britain, the United States stands out clearly today as a champion of the 3-mile limit.

While during the prohibition era a treaty was made with Great Britain, in 1924, to permit searches to be made for prohibition violations outside of the 3-mile limit, the posi-

tion that the 3-mile limit was the boundary of territorial jurisdiction was expressly reasserted. (See art. I of that treaty.)

The 3-mile limit was accepted in the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration, which took place in 1910, between the United States and Great Britain.

The Constitution of the State of California expressly asserts the 3-mile limit.

Article XXI of the Constitution of California, entitled "Boundary," after describing the land boundary, reads as follows:

Thence running west and along said boundary line to the Pacific Ocean and extending therein 3 English miles.

On the other hand, in respect to vessels of American registry, the United States has jurisdiction outside of the 3-mile limit and wherever the ship might happen to be (*United States v. Flores*, 289 U. S. 137).

In the case of closed bays, and so forth, the 3-mile limit is computed not from the coast line but from an imaginary line drawn from headland to headland, enclosing the bay. On that basis, Monterey Bay has been held to constitute territorial waters, and therefore subject to the jurisdiction of California, although the bay is about 9 miles deep (*Ocean Industries, Inc., v. Superior Court*, 200 Calif. 236; *Ocean Industries, Inc., v. Greene*, 15 F. (2d) 862.) This is likewise true of San Pedro Bay (*United States v. Carrillo*, 13 F. Supp. 121).

On the other hand, Santa Monica Bay, in which several of the gambling ships are anchored, has been held not to constitute a closed bay, and the conclusion was reached by one of the district courts of appeal of California that in the case of Santa Monica Bay the 3-mile limit is to be computed from the shore line (*California v. Stralla*, 1939 American Maritime Cases, 729.) This decision was rendered a few months ago. It should be noted, however, that it is not a decision of the highest court of the State.

Please note that in the convention between Great Britain and the United States, of January 23, 1923, article I thereof, the following is declared:

The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coast line outward and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

Thus, 3 marine miles constitute the proper limits of territorial waters. This means that as to ships flying a foreign flag and under foreign registry, the American Government has no control except by treaty.

During the prohibition era we had such jurisdiction over rum runners of foreign registry, beyond the 3-mile limit and up to 12 miles. In other words, we were given the right to search these rum-runner ships of foreign registry up to 12 miles of our shores on the condition that we had reason to believe that violations of the law had occurred within the 3-mile limit.

We have complete jurisdiction constitutionally over any American ship flying the American flag no matter whether it be in the waters of Constantinople Harbor or 100 miles up the Congo River in South Africa. We thus have constitutional jurisdiction over these gambling ships.

By this bill, Congress would confer jurisdiction on the Department of Justice to enable the latter to abate the operations of these ships. If these ships change their registry to that of a foreign flag, we will have to do as we did during the prohibition era, namely, arrange by treaty with other nations to obtain the consent of such nations to get after these ships.

It would seem anomalous if we could not render aid to save the State of California, thus helpless in the face of gamblers maintaining their nefarious operations on these four ships.

The committee has offered amendments which limit the operation of the penalties of the bill to any ship principally used as a gambling establishment. The bill is also worded so that no legitimate line, on which innocent games of chance are played, would be penalized. Thus, ocean-going liners and boats on cruises, on which passengers play bingo

and miniature horse racing, would not come within the operations of the bill. The wording of this measure has been approved by the association of legitimate steamship companies.

We preclude Federal authorities from acting within the confines of a State, that is, within the 3-mile limit. We want the State to act exclusively within such 3-mile area. This bill empowers the Department of Justice to act where a vessel is on the high seas, that is, beyond the 3-mile limit.

The Department of State, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Justice are all desirous of cleaning up this horrible situation and ask expeditious action. The Bureau of Customs and the Coast Guard particularly fear hampering of their operations by these ships.

I am informed that the Attorney General of California has sought to abate the operations of these ships even beyond the 3-mile limit, on the ground that the effects of such operations are felt within the 3-mile limit. I believe he is wrong in this regard; I believe he has no jurisdiction outside of the 3-mile limit.

I am informed further that the Attorney General and the operators of these ships have each obtained against each other orders to show cause in the State courts why each side should not be restrained.

I urge the bill's passage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, making certain observations with reference to the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 7389, and to include therein a short article that appeared in the New York Sun of August 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

SALE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 375, to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this joint resolution to the House?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities. This is the situation: We have an opportunity to sell to foreign governments 175,000 bales of surplus cotton now being carried under loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The deal contemplates full value for the cotton, except that storage for a period of 18 months will be borne by the Corporation. This cotton is to be held for a period of 5 years unless needed for war purposes by the foreign governments. That is the purpose of the bill.

The bill is drawn after the pattern of legislation passed a day or two ago and has a safeguarding amendment with respect to the storage of cotton exactly like that included in the bill which provided for the delivery of cotton under contract with Great Britain in pursuance of a treaty entered into between Great Britain and the United States. The bill comes to the House with a unanimous report of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if this does not also apply to other commodities so that they may move?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does, but the purpose is to deal primarily with the sale of 175,000 bales of cotton at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to this bill, because I personally feel that anything now which will expedite the movement of cotton, fats, and oils in particular into the channels of consumption is something we can support. I feel that we face one of the most chaotic conditions so far as these particular commodities are concerned that has ever been found in this country. I further understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation, acting on the suggestion of the chairman the other day to the effect they have ample power under present law, will proceed to effect reasonable rates on these various commodities in which the Government is becoming heavily interested, so that reasonable rates on storage and insurance will be granted to those who store these commodities.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it is fair to say this has the unanimous support of the committee. We all should understand there is no limitation of time. The only advantage that can be seen, apparently, is that another nation might get free 18 months' storage. The limitation is that they shall hold it for 5 years unless an emergency arises, but if an emergency did arise immediately, they would gain on the matter of price and 18 month's storage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if there was any change made in the amendment adopted by the House with reference to storage?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not the slightest. We put in this measure an amendment identical with that which appears in the former bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, upon terms, conditions, and in quantities prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and approved by the President, is authorized to sell surplus agricultural commodities, acquired by such Corporation through its loan operations, to foreign governments on the condition that, except for rotation to prevent deterioration, such commodities shall be held in reserve by such governments for a period of not less than 5 years from the date of acquisition, and shall not be disposed of unless a war or war emergency results in a serious interruption of normal supplies of such commodities: *Provided*, That under this joint resolution no concession below the prevailing world market price for the unrestricted use of such commodities, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be granted, in consideration of the obligation assumed by such governments to hold such commodities in reserve as required hereinbefore, in excess of a maximum amount equal to the average carrying charges, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that would be incurred if such commodities should be held for an additional 18-months' period by the Commodity Credit Corporation.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 13, insert the following: "In determining specific cotton to be sold under this act determination shall be made by sampling and selection at the place where the cotton is stored of the date of signing any sales agreement or contract under this act, and no cotton shall be sold under any such sales agreement or contract which, after such date, is transported to any other place and there sampled and selected."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 628) to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the fourth sentence of section 4 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out, before the semicolon, the words "fifteen years" and substituting therefor the words "twenty-five years."

(b) That the sixth sentence of section 4 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The Corporation may at any time grant an extension of time to any home owner for the payment of any installment of principal or interest owed by him to the Corporation or may at any time during the existence of the mortgage grant an extension and revision of its terms to provide for the amortization by means of monthly payment sufficient to retire the interest and principal within a period not to exceed 25 years from the date of its execution if in the judgment of the Corporation the circumstances of the home owner and the condition of the security justify such extension or revision."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVEY AND STUDY OF THE NATIONAL PARKS, NATIONAL MONUMENTS, AND NATIONAL SHRINES

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 284.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 284

Resolved, That, for the purpose of making a survey and obtaining information necessary as a basis for legislation, the Committee on the Public Lands, as a whole, or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of the national parks, national monuments, and national shrines, and of the administration of them and of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to them. The committee shall report to the House, as soon as practicable after January 3, 1940, the result of its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, since this resolution was called up on yesterday I have had a talk with the chairman of the committee and also the gentleman from Utah, who is thoroughly familiar with this resolution. I have no further objection; in fact, I am in accord with the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that last night when I objected I did so on the ground that a volume came to my desk some months ago which is entitled "Report to the Secretary of the Interior on the Preservation of Historic Sites and Buildings." I simply wanted to persuade the House that this volume is in existence, that these surveys have been made, and that there must be a veritable mount of material on this subject in the Department of the Interior at the present time. This is the report thereon. It would indicate that the resolution now pending is not absolutely necessary. However, I shall not object unless some member of the Committee on Public Lands objects from this side or that side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 285

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 284 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$2,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by

the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF OHIO

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5118) for the relief of the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of Ohio the sum of \$1,338,160.92, being the amount of payments with respect to old-age assistance under title I of the Social Security Act for the month of October 1933, not paid to such State on account of the refusal of the Social Security Board to certify such amount for payment to such State.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3959) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "purposes", strike out all down to and including "areas" in line 9.

Page 2, line 20, after "finding", insert ", after notice to such grantee or lessee and after an opportunity for a hearing."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This is a bill that passed the House some time ago and went to the Senate and was amended by the Senate in a small particular. I am asking simply that we concur in the amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is that small particular?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The bill gives the right to lease certain properties to States and subdivisions thereof, and the Senate has cut down the authority in some particulars; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is not very clear.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will read the bill to the gentleman if he desires.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to know what the purpose of the amendments is.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The matter has been considered by the House previously and the bill has been passed by the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that, but I am speaking of the amendments. How do the amendments change the House bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The amendments change the House bill so that it will not include lands added by Executive order recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. This has reference to areas contiguous to the park area.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this have a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This has a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Lands, both in the Senate and in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN NICHOLAS CHICOURAS

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1617) for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws John Nicholas Chicouras, of Aberdeen, Miss., shall be held and considered to have been legally admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 25, 1925, and the Secretary of Labor is authorized and directed to permit said John Nicholas Chicouras to reenter the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADLINE VERA BUCHOLZ

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7246) for the relief of Madeline Vera Bucholz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Madeline Vera Bucholz, and that she shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States as an immigrant for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "Bucholz" as spelled and insert the word "Buchholz" spelled correctly.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Madeline Vera Buchholz."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter written by a former Member of this House, Hon. John O'Connor, to Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, under date of August 3, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OF BRIEN M'MAHON

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when I was momentarily absent from the floor the bill S. 2478 passed unanimously. I am sure few knew what it was all about. The House relied upon the Judiciary Committee. The House did not know that the committee was divided. I regret that legislation should be passed under such circumstances.

I had filed a minority report. The bill involved a principle to which I am opposed and which I have consistently opposed for many years. In view of the fact that the minority report was not before the House at the time the bill passed and in order that I may not be misunderstood because I object to the consideration of other similar bills now pending, and because I should have objected and demanded a vote had that been possible, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include

in these remarks the short minority report. It is too late to stop this bill, but I hope that no future effort will be made to pass bills where there are minority reports without the minority members of the committee knowing about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

United States Code, title 5, section 99, provides as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any person appointed as an officer, clerk, or employee in any of the departments, to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States which was pending in either of said departments while he was such officer, clerk, or employee, nor in any manner, nor by any means, to aid in the prosecution of any such claim, within 2 years next after he shall have ceased to be such officer, clerk, or employee."

The purpose of this bill is to relieve Brien McMahon from the operation of this statute.

Mr. McMahon was an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice in charge of the Criminal Division. He resigned from the Department some time ago. However, he has been continued in the employment of the Department of Justice as special counsel, looking after the cases referred to in the Attorney General's letter, printed in the majority committee report above. My understanding is that Mr. McMahon drew \$10,000 a year for full-time work as Assistant Attorney General, and that he will receive this same compensation for part-time work as special counsel looking after the cases referred to. Under the above law, Mr. McMahon will not be permitted to take any cases against the Government for a period of 2 years from the date of his resignation. If this bill is enacted, that condition will not be changed and Mr. McMahon may possibly be continued at the same salary as special counsel for a number of years, and may immediately take cases against the Government upon the expiration of the 2-year period now running, without reference to this special employment.

This law (sec. 99) was enacted on June 1, 1872. There was a reason for its enactment. It has served a splendid purpose and should be respected.

As shown by the Attorney General's letter, printed in the majority report, there is precedent for this bill; seven exceptions were made between 1934 and 1937. The Judiciary Committee of the House has also reported a bill similar to this bill for the relief of Karl L. Ristine. If these bills are both enacted into law, then it would appear that nine occasions have arisen since 1934 when this wholesome law has been put aside.

This is another one of these cases where a young attorney takes employment with the Government, becomes familiar with a particular line of work, is a successful lawyer, and desires to retire from the Government service and enter a more lucrative field of practice and take cases against the Government. The effect of this bill will be to provide Mr. McMahon with an annual retainer fee of not to exceed \$10,000 a year as compensation for giving part-time consideration to cases designated by the Attorney General and be relieved from the operation of section 99 after the expiration of the first 2-year period.

Mr. McMahon is a splendid lawyer, has rendered good service to the Government, has now severed his connection with the Government, and there is no justification for making an exception in his case. This law should be enforced or repealed. No favorites should be played. I shall not have time to present this report to others who voted against reporting this bill.

EARL C. MICHENER.

THE SMALLEST ELECTRIC MOTOR

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Washington the Federal Government is building the largest dam in the world, the Grand Coulee, the greatest thing conceived by the mind of man and constructed by the hand of man.

In our State also has been constructed the smallest electric motor. It is only thirteen-billionths of 1 horsepower. I have it here with me and will show it in the lobby to any of you who are interested. We cannot bring the Grand Coulee to you. We cordially invite you to come out there and see it; but I have this tiny motor with me, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the data about this electric motor.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Can you use that in a Packard car all right?

Mr. HILL. You can use it in a Packard car, yes; for the amusement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston], who is universally regarded as the "wag of the House" and most entertaining storyteller.

On Saturday I will have the privilege of presenting this tiny motor to President Roosevelt for his inspection. He will ever be remembered in history as the one who first gave actual support and momentum to the building of the Grand Coulee, and the greatest friend public power has ever had. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MOTOR DATA

Size: 0.058 inch long, 0.058 inch high, 0.062 inch wide.
Contains 11 pieces.
Revolutions per minute: 3,600.
Voltage: 0.017 of 1 volt.
Construction time: 191 hours.
Weight: One thousand one hundred ninety-five one hundred thousandths of 1 gram.
It would require 2,388 motors this size to weigh 1 ounce.
Shaft size: 0.004 inch in diameter.
Stator winding: Eight turns of No. 40 enameled copper wire.
Bearings: Gold sleeve.
Horsepower: Thirteen billionths of 1 horsepower.
Constructed by Merle L. Bassett, Kelso, Wash.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE of Oregon addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

UNLAWFUL USE OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATION BADGES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate, which was read:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
August 3, 1939.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5982) entitled "An act for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by the act of Congress and providing penalties for the violation thereof."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WALLACE—REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATION IN THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I regard Secretary Wallace as one of my friends and entertain a high regard for his character, his integrity, his capacity, and his gentility of spirit, even though we do not always agree on matters of policy. Because of this high respect I have for him, it was with some distress of spirit that I read his statement in the morning papers of August 3 in which he characterized the Republicans in Congress as "the best organized and most irresponsible opposition" to the policies of the administration. This statement was prompted, no doubt, by defeat of the amendment to restore to the third deficiency bill an item of \$119,599,000 for the repair of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation so that this agency might continue its program of commodity loans in accordance with the mandate carried in the Farm Act of 1938.

I agree that the Republicans are well organized, but I cannot agree that they are irresponsible in their opposition. Nor can I agree that it was due to the Republicans that this item was not inserted in the deficiency appropriation bill.

In the first place, the bill was reported by the Appropriations Committee, consisting of 24 Democrats and 15 Republicans.

In the second place, it was considered in a Congress consisting of 260 Democrats, 169 Republicans, 2 Progressives, 1 Farmer-Labor, and 1 American Labor Member.

In the third place, two members of the Appropriations Committee—namely, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is a Democrat, and myself—fought the committee on this item and sought to secure its incorporation in the bill.

In the fourth place, other Republicans actively supported this effort during the debate on the floor.

In the fifth place, I took particular note of those who passed between the tellers when this item was defeated by the narrow vote of 116 to 110 and observed that a substantial group of Republicans supported the amendment. I also observed that the majority of those who voted against the amendment came from the Democratic side.

It can scarcely be contended, therefore, that the Republicans defeated the Commodity Credit Corporation item so that loans might continue to be made on farm commodities.

Republicans from the Farm Belt appreciate, as does the Secretary, the necessity for this item and made a determined effort to secure its enactment.

I express the hope, therefore, that the genial and charming Secretary will make public correction of the impression which he may have left with the country because he has been misinformed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a number of brief editorials and short excerpts from articles and criticisms and comments on the proceedings of the House of May 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the bill (H. R. 5749) to provide for the construction and operation by the Federal Government of a system of new, durable, hard-surfaced toll automobile highways, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the distinguished newspaper editor of Rochester, N. Y., Mr. Frank Gannett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from the secretary of commerce of the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

W. P. A. FURLONGHS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Harrington, Work Projects Administrator, was quoted in the press a few days ago as saying that he "did not plan to rescind his recent order halting furloughs for W. P. A. workers who have been on the rolls 18 months or longer until he can determine whether Congress is going to change the relief act."

Colonel Harrington had halted furloughs as a result of the amendment of Senator MURRAY of Montana to the lending bill, while that bill was pending in the Senate. Colonel Harrington is to be complimented for his action.

The "30-day furlough" provision of the present law works great hardship on a deserving class of persons. It certainly works considerably more hardship than it does good. It is a provision that results in such extreme hardship that it should be repealed or sharply modified.

The argument that persons whose names are upon eligible lists, but who cannot be assigned to a project because of quota limitations, as a justification for the furloughing of those who will be affected, is inequitable. It is based upon the unfair idea that Congress is justified in harming some persons, many thousands, in this case, to help others. Such a procedure or policy does not appeal to me. It never has.

There are other sound arguments in favor of those who have not been assigned as yet to a project, without harming one group to help them. I doubt very much even if those who will benefit want to do so at the expense of others who are badly in need of assistance.

It is admitted that at least 90 percent of those who will be affected are deserving cases. What are they going to do during the furlough period? Certainly, any assumption that any such persons have been able to save any money is an erroneous one. Furthermore, while it is called in the law a "30-day furlough," it will be in fact, in most cases, a considerably longer, if not permanent separation. If persons are furloughed, and other persons assigned in their places, at the end of 30 days will those furloughed be reassigned? Will the opportunity exist for such action? The simple and honest answer is "No."

The better course to follow, it appears to me, instead of proceeding upon the theory of harming one group to help another, both of whom are badly in need of assistance, is to make a special investigation of such cases to ascertain among those who have been employed 18 months or longer which persons have had their family income changed so that at the present time they do not meet the eligibility requirements of the W. P. A., fill their places from existing eligible lists, instead of arbitrarily furloughing all persons, without regard to their finances, without regard to the distress that will follow.

At the time that this provision was before the House, the membership did not have an opportunity of passing upon it in a direct roll-call vote. An opportunity of passing upon other provisions of the bill by a direct vote was also not afforded to the Members of the House. Such an opportunity should be given to us. Congress should not adjourn without this provision being repealed or sharply modified, thereby averting the extreme hardship that the existing law will produce to many thousands of persons throughout the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a speech I made on the outside.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Daily American Somerset.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 944, the wool-labeling bill, and include therein a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Committee report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT OF 1933

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill (H. R. 6971) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes will be laid on the table, a similar Senate bill having recently passed the House.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD upon two separate subjects and include in each of them some brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, one having to do with the California State Assembly and the other to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent permission to revise and extend their own remarks was granted to Mr. BROOKS, Mr. LUDLOW, and Mr. D'ALESSANDRO.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of Federal jurisprudence and to include a brief statement by Assistant Attorney General Holtzoff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CASE OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER], in speaking about Harry Bridges, the notorious alien labor racketeer out on the Pacific coast, made the following statement, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 10453:

I do not know about Harry Bridges. I do not know whether he is a member of the Communist Party or not. He claims he is not. I do know this: I know, as the gentleman has said, he has caused a lot of trouble here. Yes; he has caused a lot of trouble. But for whom? For the employers who were trying to make the longshoremen work for 10 cents an hour.

Now, I hope the gentleman desires to be fair, but the statement he made is a gross misrepresentation of the actual facts. In the interests of fair play, and to keep the RECORD straight, let us take a look at some of the figures.

Prior to the big strike in 1934, which tied up the San Francisco water front for 83 days, longshoremen were receiving 85 cents per hour straight time and \$1.25 per hour overtime. Does that sound like 10 cents an hour? Since the 1934 strike they have been receiving 95 cents per hour and \$1.40 per hour overtime. The San Francisco longshoremen,

on their own statements, have the best working conditions in the world; they have frequently stressed the fact that none of their members are on relief. So what! On June 2, despite operating losses, the water-front employers offered to renew the existing contract, as is, and the longshoremen refused.

Since 1934 Mr. Bridges' influence has made itself felt in many ways. Twenty-six steamship lines have folded up or moved to other seas. There have been about 300 stoppages of work, ranging from a half hour to 14 days, each an open violation of existing contracts, together with a second major strike in 1936-37 lasting 99 days.

Yes, indeed; Mr. Bridges' influence has been felt up and down the Pacific coast. I wonder what the total cost to the American public has been as a result of his activities. The cost in cargo diversions, lost man-hours, business, and so forth, has been incalculable. Idle cargoes, idle men, farmers' produce spoiling on the docks, world markets lost which can never be regained.

Mr. Bridges did his job well, but the Labor Department has finally caught up with him. He is now being investigated as an undesirable alien, subject to deportation. I trust that the Department will review the situation fairly and impartially. If that is done, when a decision is handed down Mr. Bridges will undoubtedly be removed from the United States and consigned to the country from whence he came. We Americans can get along very nicely without him. [Applause.]

PUBLIC USE OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Senate resolution which was spoken about somewhat yesterday?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. It changes two country roads.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, the maintenance of those roads is not expected to be on an elaborate scale?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TABER. That is, it is not expected that the Secretary of the Interior will maintain and improve the roads?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not.

Mr. TABER. They are just dirt roads?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Just dirt roads, to give those farmers who have been bottled up on either side of the mountain a chance to get across, as they have been doing for the last hundred years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

Whereas the State of Virginia acquired and deeded to the Federal Government an area of approximately 180,571 acres for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park; and

Whereas from early Colonial days this area has been traversed by certain essential and historic public highways; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has caused to be closed all highways crossing the Blue Ridge Mountains in the area of the said Shenandoah National Park, except United States Highway No. 211 and United States Highway No. 33, to the great injury and inconvenience of the people of Virginia: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to keep open and available to the public in a safe condition for travel, the following-named highways, from their intersection with the Skyline Drive to the boundary line of the Shenandoah National Park: State Highway Nos. 629 and 663, known as the Browns Gap Road, and State Highway Nos. 611 and 649, known as the Gordonsville-New Market Turnpike.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GILLIE, and Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire were granted permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a great many Members have asked me if general consent was given on yesterday for Members to revise and extend their own remarks on the housing bill. I understand that was not done, and in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 155]

Anderson, Mo.	Dies	Lanham	Sandager
Ashbrook	Dingell	Lea	Schaefer, Ill.
Barnes	Ditter	Lesinski	Secrest
Barton	Douglas	Luce	Short
Bates, Ky.	Eaton, Calif.	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Beam	Eaton, N. J.	McMillan, Thos. S.	Stearns, N. H.
Boren	Elliott	Magnuson	Stefan
Bradley, Pa.	Fernandez	Mansfield	Sullivan
Brewster	Fish	Massingale	Summers, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	May	Sweeney
Byron	Flannery	Mitchell	Thill
Caldwell	Folger	Murdoch, Ariz.	Thomas, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Neal	Vincent, Ky.
Chapman	Fries	Osmer	Weaver
Cluett	Green	Parsons	Welch
Coffee, Nebr.	Gregory	Patman	White, Idaho
Collins	Harrington	Pfeifer	White, Ohio
Cooley	Hennings	Powers	Wood
Corbett	Holmes	Rabaut	Woodruff, Mich.
Creal	Hook	Rankin	Woodrum, Va.
Crowe	Keller	Reece, Tenn.	Zimmerman
Crowther	Kennedy, Martin	Reed, N. Y.	
Cummings	Knutson	Robsion, Ky.	
Curley	Kunkel	Rogers, Okla.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 335 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 281. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 281

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 2240, an act to provide for a national census of housing. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Census, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. Pending that, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, unless the present session of Congress acts it will be impossible to take a census of housing in conjunction with the 1940 population census. The opportunity to secure housing facts with population figures will not recur for 10 years.

This bill authorizes an impartial, scientific gathering of facts. It does not commit the Congress or the administration to any course of action. But it will provide essential knowledge, upon which future action in the Seventy-seventh and subsequent Congresses can be taken.

This bill would be of benefit to business, to businessmen, to all lending agencies, to labor, to Congress, to the Federal agencies interested in housing and reemployment, and to many State and local agencies.

I am told that there has been no opposition whatsoever received by the committee from any business or governmental agency; that not a single letter, telegram, or oral statement from business or governmental agencies has been made to the committee in opposition to this measure. On the contrary, it has, I understand, received unanimous and urgent support from business and government alike.

The housing statistics which will be obtained under this authorization are desired and needed by both Government and business alike. The committee believes that a housing census is essential to insure the most economical and intelligent development of residential construction, with its great potentialities for the investment of idle capital, stimulation of durable-goods industries, and the relief of unemployment.

The bill is strongly approved by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The proposal for a housing census has been urged by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the American Federation of Labor, the United States Conference of Mayors, and many business groups.

In the interests of maximum economy, accuracy, and value of the data to the Nation, a census of housing should be taken in close relation to a census of population. If taken at any other time its cost would be materially increased because of the necessity of setting up a special field staff for this purpose, while if taken in conjunction with the population census the extensive staff of trained enumerators could be used.

Somebody remarked to me that they feared this was an effort to make people dissatisfied with the homes they have now. Mr. Speaker, I was born in an humble home. If I thought this bill had any tendency to make men dissatisfied with their homes, I should not be here advocating this rule.

I stand for the old-fashioned home with its ideals. In answer to my friend who said a housing census might make the people dissatisfied with their homes, I would say that we want to save the homes. They may have modern conveniences, I hope they do; but some of the most ideal homes, the happiest homes, I have ever known, were without such. One trouble, Mr. Chairman, is that in these modern days the home, instead of being a service station is too often but a filling station. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks very briefly at this point in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to resist this rule; however, I am opposed to the bill, because, in my judgment, it provides for an improvident and unnecessary expenditure of public money. I applaud the very eloquent apostrophe

which my distinguished colleague from Missouri paid to the old-fashioned home. I am a product of the old-fashioned home myself. Instead of patriotism residing in the palaces I think that the very seat of patriotism is in the old-fashioned home. But this measure, if enacted into law, will not improve the character of the old-fashioned home in any respect, so far as I can see.

This is a rather novel idea. We have never had any census of the homes before and to me this proposition smacks of a promotion scheme.

On the third page of the report you will find a suggestion as to what is proposed by this legislation. This report states—

Although some sample studies have been made, there are no reliable figures for the rural United States as a whole on such essential facts as the types of houses now in use, their age, condition, size, and facilities for heating and lighting—

And so forth. It is the intention of the Census Department to ascertain the ages of homes, the types of homes, the number of toilets, the heating facilities, the electrical appliances, the number of radios, bathtubs, musical instruments, and things of that kind, which clearly indicate to me that the purpose of this legislation is promotional. One of the purposes of this legislation is to ascertain the number of homes that are encumbered by mortgage or otherwise, and also encumbrance on home equipment. The head of the family will take pride in telling the enumerator how many children he has and their sexes, but he will suffer some embarrassment when he is asked if his piano or his radio is paid for and how many installments are still outstanding.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. After that information is obtained, just what good will that do so far as helping the people of this country is concerned?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. It is not going to help the home owner, but it will afford data for people who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of musical instruments, electrical appliances, and things of that kind. In my judgment, that is the nub of the whole proposition.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER].

Mr. GEYER of California. The gentleman is not really serious about not wanting to aid business, is he?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Why, of course, I want to aid business, but it is not the province of the taxpayers of this country to furnish the business people of the country with data which they should acquire at their own expense.

Mr. GEYER of California. I thought the gentleman was in favor of anything that would help business and that that would help the people.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Yes. My votes on this floor have shown that I am interested in promoting business. I think I demonstrated that on two occasions this week when I voted against the housing and lending-spending fallacies.

Mr. GEYER of California. I should think the gentleman would be for this then.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Here you are making the Government an instrumentality to collect data and information to furnish business which business itself ought to acquire at its own expense.

Mr. DONDERO. When the people have enough money to buy the things the gentleman has mentioned, they will usually buy them without some census bureau furnishing the information to the businessman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Is it not true that every one of our departments go out and gather information and data for the use of the people of the country, not especially business but for everybody, including the gentleman and myself?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. This is the first time the Government has ever embarked on a snooping and fishing excursion of this character.

Mr. KELLER. I agree with that, but is it not true that it had to do it the first time in connection with a lot of other things?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman withdraw that for the present?

Mr. CARTER. I will withhold it for the present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Illinois, this is a poor time, in my opinion, for the Federal Government to unnecessarily and wantonly waste \$8,000,000 on a scheme of this kind. We have already authorized \$45,000,000 to take the population census, and we have already appropriated \$21,000,000 for that purpose, which is about twice as much as it cost 10 years ago to take the same census.

Mr. KELLER. What other proposition would be of greater interest and benefit to the population of the country than a thoroughgoing knowledge of the condition of the homes of the country?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Oh, we could carry this program to any sort of an extreme. I have an idea that the gentleman would like for us to go out and count the butterflies and the beetles, as has been done in some sections under the beneficent New Deal.

Mr. KELLER. May I suggest that the gentleman's imagination is running wild this morning.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. It seems to me that the gentleman wants to collect all sorts of information for the benefit of somebody, regardless of how much it will cost the Federal Treasury.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman any knowledge or information as to the amount of money that has been expended under W. P. A. projects set up to do this identical work throughout the Nation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I understand that several million dollars have been so expended. I know that down in my section, in the T. V. A. area, the T. V. A. agencies have been acquiring just such information as is provided by this proposed measure.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman that in the district I represent numerous W. P. A. projects have been set up and any number of people have been engaged in projects just exactly like this for a long period of time, gathering different information.

Mr. MASON. Including the building of outhouses.

Mr. KEEFE. This is a duplication of effort.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct; it is just supplementing and duplicating work that has already been done.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman know whether those reports have ever been compiled and made available? Has anybody ever seen the result of the expenditure of all the money that has been spent for that purpose under W. P. A.?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I seriously doubt if there has ever been any compilation of the information that has been acquired, as suggested by the gentleman, because it is utterly worthless.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. That has been here, there, and yonder, for the very purpose of justifying a thing of this kind. The statistics have been compiled.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Does the gentleman know that we have built about a million outside privies?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. How many?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Nearly a million, a little over 900,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We have built them at the expense of the taxpayers, and now we want to go out and count them. If we could utilize the services of "Chic" Sale in this undertaking it might be worth while.

Mr. MASON. That is the idea.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. That is the idea, of course.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This survey will be just as useful as a certain allotment made by W. P. A. whereby W. P. A. allowed \$300,000 to one county to establish doll-lending centers. It will be just as about as useful to the people as that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Certainly. This is the same type of research and investigation as has been suggested by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I hope the gentleman will be for the rule in order to permit a real discussion of this subject.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I announced at the outset that I am not opposing the rule.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. May I inquire of the gentleman if he will be kind enough to indicate whether or not he believes that all the surveys made by the Department of Commerce for the purpose of developing information of use to business are of the same type he now characterizes this survey as being?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Of course, I am not familiar with all the activities of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the fact that the Research Division of the Department of Commerce has developed information that is of great benefit to the businessmen of this country.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Oh, I am not surprised, for instance, that the Construction League of America has endorsed this measure, that the Associated General Contractors of America are in favor of it, or that the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association is supporting the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Is not the gentleman willing to have these people benefit by this information?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. As I stated a moment ago, I am opposed to the Federal Government spending money to acquire data and information for business that business ought to acquire itself at its own expense. I explained that at the outset.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman is not opposed to the Government spending money to develop the T. V. A. system, is he?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am very heartily in favor of that, as the gentleman must know.

I am not surprised that the Portland Cement Association should endorse legislation of this type, or the National Lime Association, the Mason Contractors Association, the Structural Clay Products Institute, or the Metal Window Institute. Of course the Metal Window Institute wants to know just what kind of windows there are in these old-fashioned homes, whether they are wooden windows or metal windows. If the Government will just be kind enough to spend the

money to obtain that information for them, of course they will greatly appreciate it.

There is a minority report filed on this bill which sets out the fact that the legislation was not given material consideration. The Director of the Bureau of the Census never appeared before the committee to explain the scope of the bill. The minority contend that this bill was reported out without the benefit of the counsel of the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Director of the Bureau of the Census did not appear before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The minority report sets out that the Director of the Bureau of the Census never appeared before the committee to explain the scope and purpose of the bill as amended, and I accept that statement on faith, of course.

Mr. DUNN. May I say that the Director of the Bureau of the Census did appear before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. That is a contradiction of the minority report.

Mr. MASON. Not on this feature, however.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am opposed to this bill because, as I stated at the outset, it provides for the expenditure of an exorbitant sum of money to perform a task that is not the business of the Federal Government. This is a very poor time in view of the terrible plight of the Federal Treasury to waste another \$8,000,000 in experimentation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In order that the RECORD may be clear, the minority report recites this:

The Director of the Bureau of the Census never appeared before the committee to explain the scope of this bill as amended.

The day that the Director was present, when the original bill was considered, the bill was tabled by the committee. The only contact with the Director of the Bureau of the Census on the day this bill was considered was by telephone.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The only thing I regret is that the bill did not continue on the table, because I believe it is utterly useless and unnecessary legislation. [Applause.] This legislation, if enacted, will authorize an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the home, and should meet the defeat which it deserves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 156]

Alexander	Ditter	Kunkel	Schaefer, Ill.
Andrews	Douglas	Lambertson	Secret
Barnes	Drewry	Lanham	Short
Barton	Eaton, Calif.	Lesinski	Smith, Conn.
Boren	Eaton, N. J.	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Brewster	Elliott	McMillan, Thos. S.	Stearns, N. H.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Magnuson	Stefan
Byron	Fish	Marshall	Sullivan
Caldwell	Fitzpatrick	Massingale	Sumners, Tex.
Chapman	Flannery	May	Sweeney
Cluett	Folger	Mitchell	Taylor, Colo.
Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Brien	Thill
Collins	Green	Osmer	Thomas, N. J.
Cooley	Halleck	Parsons	Vincent, Ky.
Courtney	Harrington	Patman	Wadsworth
Creal	Hennings	Powers	Welch
Crowe	Holmes	Rabaut	Wolfenden, Pa.
Crowther	Hook	Rankin	Wood
Cummings	Horton	Reece, Tenn.	Woodruff, Mich.
Curley	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.	
Dies	Kennedy, Martin	Robison, Ky.	
Dingell	Knutson	Ryan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a petition signed by various Members of the House.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what the petition is, please?

Mr. CULKIN. It is a petition signed by 10 Members of the House from dairying States.

Mr. CHURCH. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of waterways and to include therein certain extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the policies pursued this year by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull that their secret alliance with Great Britain with respect to Europe extends to Asia as well. If such an alliance does exist, there can be only one result for the United States—war.

President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, not finding a convenient war in Europe to enter, have found a convenient war to enter in Asia, and they are taking the first steps to enter it.

It would appear from current dispatches that the United States is supporting Great Britain in its immediate differences with Japan. These differences involve questions of British interests in Chinese Nationalist currency and Chinese silver in British banks in Tientsin. These are political questions in which the United States is represented as intervening on the side of Great Britain. Such intervention would be unneutral as between China and Japan in their war. It would be political intervention which might well call for accusation and retaliation.

The United States should certainly maintain a policy of genuine neutrality and should immediately disassociate itself from Great Britain, whose political and economic interests in China so greatly exceed those of the United States.

The United States cannot underwrite the boundaries, the political commitments, and the interests of Great Britain in Europe and Asia without becoming involved in war—and war would mean the destruction of our Republic.

I am accordingly introducing in the House today a joint resolution which seeks to put Congress on record as opposed to the administration's course in the East and in favor of strict neutrality. [Applause.]

The resolution referred to follows:

Joint resolution providing that the United States should maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Asia

Whereas it is charged openly and the facts would seem to demonstrate that the United States has a secret alliance with Great Britain in relation to both Europe and Asia;

Whereas such an alliance must inevitably mean war for the United States; and

Whereas by a succession of newspaper dispatches it is disclosed that the Department of State is actively participating through communications and conferences in relation to the support of the Chinese Nationalist currency, in a conflict between Great Britain and Japan, and in relation to Chinese silver in the British banks in Tientsin, as well as in other matters which affect Great Britain; and

Whereas such conduct by the Department of State in the war in Asia is political intervention in Asia and is wholly unneutral; and

Whereas such conduct cannot but involve the United States on the side of Great Britain in its differences with Japan and must ultimately lead the United States into war: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the United States should maintain a policy of strict neutrality in relation to the war now taking place between China and Japan and disassociate itself from Great Britain, whose political and economic interests in China are paramount and are now in conflict with the interests of Japan, and that war with Japan in support of British interests would mean disaster for the United States.

NATIONAL CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we are here considering a rule to authorize the consideration of a bill to provide for the taking of a housing census costing \$8,000,000.

Now, why are we going to take this census? The committee has reported an amendment which states that we are not only going to take a census of the number, but also the characteristics, including utilities and equipment of all the houses in this country.

In taking the census for 150 years it has always been customary to take the name, the age, and the address. Do the folk that got up this bill assume that the people whose names have been taken did not live in houses in the previous census? When it appears that a man lives on a particular farm or on a particular road in a town or at a particular street number in a city, that is evidence in itself that he lives in a house. Now, it is true that such a census would not provide information as to whether the madam of the house had an electric curling iron, and it would not tell whether or not she had two radios or three, neither would it tell whether or not the water in the house was supplied by a well with a hand pump or a power pump, or whether or not it was supplied from city mains.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has omitted one thing. Neither would they know whether the gentleman of the house has an electric razor or whether the madam has some electric waffle irons or a pancake griddle.

Mr. TABER. Well, the electric razor would be very important, because they say it only takes three times as long to shave with one of them as it does with an ordinary razor. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULKIN. And not as close.

Mr. TABER. That is probably so.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to know what authority there is in the law that would compel a householder to disclose what he did have. Can they refuse to admit him to the kitchen, or must he be admitted in every instance?

Mr. TABER. There would be no authority of law to force such admission or to force an inventory of one's private effects and utensils?

Mr. GIFFORD. What is the genesis of this request? Who wants it?

Mr. TABER. Well, this is one of those mysterious things. There have been no hearings. At one time the committee, I understand, tabled the proposition. When we asked for a copy of the hearings we were told that none were printed. It was not considered of importance enough to print the hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should not embark on this large expenditure of money at this time. The 1910 census cost \$15,968,000; the 1920 census cost \$25,117,000; the 1930 census cost \$39,381,000, and we have

already authorized an appropriation of \$45,000,000 to do this job. The Census Director tells us that is enough. Why should we go ahead and embark on a new program that sounds absolutely ridiculous, and that was so ridiculous that the committee itself put it on the table the first time the matter was considered, and for which they have had no hearings whatever? If we are going ahead and authorizing more and more appropriations, there is never going to be any recovery anywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was any necessity for this survey to be made it was dispensed with by the vote that we have had in this House in the last couple of days. The lending-spending bill cut out all of this housing project, and yesterday we voted down an \$800,000,000 appropriation, most of it to be spent in housing. The purpose of this, of course, is to go out and find some place to build a house. Most people who want to build a home know when they want to build it, and they are perfectly willing to go and get the money if they want to build a home and do it. There is no necessity for this \$8,000,000 to be spent at this time at all. It is true that there were no hearings on this bill. I inquired for them and none were had. There has been no appearance on the part of the Census Director. There is a letter here in the committee report from the president of the American Federation of Labor in which he says it would be a fine thing for the housing industry, with the plans that the Government has in mind to carry out, but this Congress has stopped that, and there is no necessity for any appropriation of this \$8,000,000 at this time. Of course, you could go out on a fishing expedition, but that would not get you any place. I remember a few years ago—I do not know whether it is true of all cities—when people in my home city went around measuring homes and counting them and seeing the different home conditions. I do not know whether that data are available at this time or not. I do say frankly that this rule should be voted down so that this bill will never be brought out for consideration. We do not need it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did these investigators to whom the gentleman refers disclose whether the houses they entered were in an unclean condition? Is that a characteristic they were trying to find?

Mr. JOHNS. I do not know what the duty of these men was, but I know they were running around with a tape line measuring the size of the houses, just like people running around on farms with a wheel measuring them, when the farmer knew the number of acres that he had, because he had a deed to it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Were they measuring the dirt?

Mr. JOHNS. I do not know about that, but I do know that you do not need any count of houses in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS], certainly did not know his lesson. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to the chairman of this Committee on the Census from the Director of the Census specifically endorsing this bill. There is also in my hand a letter from Secretary Hopkins, the last sentence of which reads as follows:

This subject has been discussed with the President and we are advised that S. 2240, as passed by the Senate, would not conflict with his program.

So, as far as its having Budget clearance is concerned, and so far as its having the endorsement of the Director of the

Census is concerned, I think that is a complete answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNS. Where did that report appear?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know, but I have in my hand a letter signed by Mr. Austin.

Mr. JOHNS. Where did the gentleman get the letter?

Mr. RAYBURN. I got it from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] to whom it was sent. I also have a letter from Secretary Hopkins addressed to the chairman of this committee. Mr. Austin says in the first paragraph of his letter that he understands there is some misunderstanding with reference to his position on this matter, and he writes this letter to the chairman of the committee in order to clear that up.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I have yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Under heading No. 2 in the minority report I find this language:

The Director of the Bureau of the Census never appeared before the committee to explain the scope of this bill as amended.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have read that. Everybody knows that.

Mr. JOHNS. That is all I said.

Mr. RAYBURN. No. I understood the gentleman to say that it did not have the endorsement of the Bureau of the Census and did not have the endorsement of the Budget. I simply wanted to clear that part of it up, because I have those two letters here.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I talked to the Director of the Bureau of the Census, and he O. K.'d the amended bill as it was.

Mr. RAYBURN. Now, let me say here is a little bill that passed the Senate unanimously. I see my east Tennessee friend smiling at me. It passed with no objection. Everybody seemed to think that this was a necessary thing to do; that it was a wholesome thing to do; that it would be beneficial to the departments of government in administering the law that is now on the statute books; that it would be helpful to business in giving them leads on various and sundry matters. Then we come here and somebody says, "Well, you turned down the lending bill. Then you turned down the housing bill. This is a back-door way of getting into the housing matter." There is nothing on earth that could be further from the truth. There could be no connection between this bill and the so-called housing bill that was voted down yesterday.

Now, as to the amount. I discussed that matter with some of the gentlemen on the minority side this morning. They said they were not going to fight this rule on the question of amount. Some people thought that because this was finally joined up with the census, and not an independent examination, this money would not be needed. I called Mr. Austin, Director of the Census, and he said that if this additional work is put upon him, he does not have one dollar with which to do it, because every dollar that Congress has given him to take the regular census has been budgeted.

It does seem to me that if everybody should agree, this would be a beneficial thing to do. It certainly cannot hurt anybody. It is endorsed by every department of government that has anything to do with this kind of matter, either directly or indirectly, and it is endorsed by an imposing array of business people, who are named in the report of the committee. I think this House would not look very well if it did not pass this rule and did not pass this bill, after it had been passed unanimously by the Senate, and no legitimate objection that I have ever heard from any speaker on either side of the aisle has been raised to it, simply because somebody thinks it can be connected up with the housing bill. They are going to get the surprise of their lives one of these days when they think we cannot pass anything in this House. It will be

much easier for some things to be passed in this House next January and February after such friends of mine as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] go home and feel the pulse of their people. [Applause.]

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. GIFFORD. Since the gentleman referred to my name, I trust he will not worry too much about the pulse of my people.

Mr. RAYBURN. No, indeed. Frankly, I like the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I like the gentleman exceedingly. I sincerely sympathize with his plea for business. Does he not think that if they show up the characteristics of our people and they find slovenly, dirty conditions, the soap peddler will learn about it and our doorbells will ring? Those are the characteristics you want to find out, are they not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, no. Surely the gentleman does not think we are going out to do scavenger work.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know how they can avoid doing it under this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman's mind may run to such things, but if I were he I would take that out when I revised my remarks.

Mr. GIFFORD. I used that as illustrative. I think the gentleman understands.

Mr. RAYBURN. Now, the gentleman used that as illustrative of what?

Mr. GIFFORD. Of this boring into other people's conditions of living and reporting it. If they find slovenly conditions, will they not report them?

Mr. RAYBURN. They would probably put it in a report.

Mr. GIFFORD. As a necessity for better housing.

Mr. RAYBURN. And with the hope that they could make living conditions a little better. Perhaps the gentleman does not understand—

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I understand.

Mr. RAYBURN. Maybe he was not reared out on the prairie somewhere, where there were no accommodations, and where, by good roads, rural electrification, and sanitary conditions being brought about, these people are now being made happy, getting a few of the accommodations that the gentleman has probably had all of his life. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Very true, but I live in a section where the housewife is proud of her handiwork.

Mr. RAYBURN. We trust that in bringing about better conditions for people who live in the villages—

Mr. GIFFORD. And I live in a section—

Mr. RAYBURN. Just a minute—in the towns and in the cities—

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, but the gentleman should let me answer.

Mr. RAYBURN. And out in the countryside, that these conditions calling for scavengers, which the gentleman mentioned, may be eliminated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6635, an act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

6635) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 22, 23, 57, 58, 69, 70, 103, 104, 117, 118, 153, 154, 166, 168, 169, 176, 177, and 182.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 165, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, and 181; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(14) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than ten net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States); or".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 508. (a) Section 531 (a) of such Act is amended by—

"(1) Striking out '\$1,938,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$3,500,000'.

"(2) Striking out '\$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$15,000'.

"(3) Inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, That the amount of such sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year shall be not less than \$20,000'.

"(b) Section 531 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out '\$102,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$150,000'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 17, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(14) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than ten net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States); or"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and wildlife"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 26, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "old-age assistance" and insert "aid to the blind"; on page 96, line 3, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "clause (1) of"; in line 7, strike out "clause" and insert "subsection"; in line 21, strike out "clause (1) of"; and on page 97, lines 18 and 19, strike out "increased by 5 per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In addition to the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, on page 36, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert the following new sentence:

"No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any overpayment refunded or credited by reason of the provisions of this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
JERE COOPER,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
FRANK CROWTHER,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,

Managers on the part of the House.

WILLIAM H. KING,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act,

and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment provides that on and after January 1, 1941, a State plan for old-age assistance in order to be approved by the Social Security Board must provide for financial participation by the State in an amount not less than \$10 each month with respect to each needy individual receiving old-age assistance for the month. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 2: The House bill stated that the State plan for old-age assistance in order to be approved by the Board must provide such methods of administration (other than those relating to selection, tenure of office, and compensation of personnel) as are found by the Board to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan. The Senate amendment struck out the parenthetical clause and inserted a new parenthetical clause which states that after January 1, 1940, such methods of administration shall include methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 3: The House bill provided, as in existing law, that the Federal Government would match on a 50-50 basis the amounts expended by the State as old-age assistance and increased the amount up to which the Federal Government will contribute one-half from \$30 to \$40. The Senate amendment retains the \$40 maximum of the House bill, and provides that the Federal Government will contribute two-thirds of the expenditures for old-age assistance under the plan up to a State-wide average of \$15 per month for the needy individuals receiving such assistance, plus one-half of the excess over such amount up to the \$40 maximum. This amendment also changed the amount to be contributed by the Federal Government for administrative expenses from 5 percent of the Federal contribution to an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during any quarter as are found necessary by the Board for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan. It also states that in the case of any State which shall reduce the amount paid in such State in 1939 to its needy individuals for old-age assistance, such State shall not receive such increased amount but shall receive from the Federal Government only one-half of the sums expended up to \$40. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This is a technical amendment made necessary by amendment No. 3 changing the matching provisions from a 50-50 basis. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10: These amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 9: The House bill provided that the administrative expenses of the Social Security Board and the Treasury Department for the administration of title II and title VIII of the Social Security Act, and the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, should be estimated monthly by the chairman of the Board and the managing trustee of the Federal old-age and survivors trust fund. The managing trustee was directed to pay each month from the trust fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the amount so estimated. The Senate amendment provides that such amount shall be estimated quarterly and that such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as repayments to the account for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the administration of such titles II and VIII and such Federal Insurance Contributions Act. The amendment also provides that such repayments shall not be available for expenditure but shall be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury. If the payments made by the trust fund to the Treasury for such cost of administration were covered into the Treasury as provided in the House bill, the receipts and expenditures would be overstated in the account of the Treasury by the amounts so deposited. Collections, when originally received, are classified in the Treasury accounts as "social-security taxes," and subsequently, under the House bill, a portion would be deposited as "miscellaneous receipts," thus overstating actual receipts. Also, when funds are expended from appropriations for such administration, such items would be shown as expenditures under "Social Security Board" and "departmental," and the reimbursements for such expenses from the trust fund would also be shown as expenditures, unless such items are deposited as repayments instead of miscellaneous receipts. The Senate amendment cures this administrative problem. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 11: The House bill provided for a small lump-sum death payment upon the death of a fully or currently insured individual, leaving no surviving widow, child, or parent, who would, on filing application in the month in which such individual died, be entitled to a benefit for such month under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 202. The Senate amendment struck out the reference to subsection (b) since this subsection deals with a wife's insurance benefit, which would not be applicable after the death of the primary individual. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 12 and 13: The House bill provided for the distribution of such lump-sum death payments and included in such distribution persons who may be entitled under the law of the State to share as distributees with the parents of the deceased. These Senate amendments eliminate this provision of the House

bill, and also provide that when more than one parent is entitled to a payment, each of them would share equally. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18: The House bill provided that any benefits payable on the basis of an individual's wages shall be reduced, so that the maximum for any benefit (if only one benefit for a month is payable with respect to the wages of an individual) or for the total of all benefits (if more than one benefit is payable for a month with respect to the wages of an individual) shall not exceed (1) \$85, or (2) two times the primary insurance benefit of such individual, or (3) 80 percent of the average monthly wage of such individual, whichever is least. This takes the place of the provision now in the Social Security Act limiting the monthly rate of benefits to \$35. The Senate amendments change this provision of the House bill so that the reduction in the amount of a benefit will be required only where the total of benefits payable with respect to an individual's wages is more than \$20, and provide that the total of benefits shall in such cases be reduced to (a) the least of the amounts referred to under (1), (2), and (3) above, or (b) \$20, whichever is greater. They also strike out reference to reduction of a single benefit as superfluous. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: The House bill provided that whenever a reduction or increase was required under subsection (a) or (b) of section 203 and more than one benefit was payable for the month with respect to the wages of an individual, each of the benefits should be proportionately increased or decreased, as the case might be. The Senate amendment excepts the primary insurance benefit from any reduction under section 203 (a) or (c). The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 20 and 21: These amendments are clarifying amendments providing that the deductions to be made from any payment or payments under title II shall be made in such amounts and at such time or times as the Board shall determine. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 22 and 23: The House bill provided that deductions would be made from a child's insurance benefit if such child was under 18 and over 16 years of age and he failed to attend school regularly. These Senate amendments were intended to make it clear that children serving as apprentices without pay shall be considered as attending school and are placed in the same category as children attending school. Since the Social Security Board has ample authority to care for this situation by regulation, it is not necessary to incorporate these provisions into the law. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 24 and 25: The House bill provided a penalty for failure to report the occurrence of an event specified in the bill which would cause a deduction in benefits. These Senate amendments require that such report be made by any individual who is in receipt of benefits subject to deduction, or is in receipt of such benefits on behalf of another individual. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 26 and 27: Under the House bill as under existing law, employees who worked for more than one employer in a year and who have a total salary from such employers of more than \$3,000 are taxable upon the first \$3,000 of such salaries from each employer. These Senate amendments provide that no more than \$3,000 total remuneration for any calendar year after 1939 is counted for benefit purposes. (See amendment No. 85 for special tax refund on such salaries in excess of \$3,000.) The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 28, 31, 32, and 33: These are clerical amendments changing paragraph numbers. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 29 and 30: These amendments exclude from the definition of wages payments made by an employer under certain conditions on behalf of his employees on account of death (including life insurance) where it is clear that the employee, while living, does not have certain rights and options. These slight changes from existing law are effective as to wages from employment after 1939. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment makes a clarifying change. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 35: Under present law services performed by an individual after he attains age 65 are not counted for benefits under title II nor are they taxed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. The House bill provided that such services performed after 1939 would be counted as employment and taxed the wages for such services after such year. The Senate amendment provides that such services performed after 1938 by such an individual shall be counted as employment. (Amendment No. 173 taxes such wages, and amendment No. 175 deducts from any benefit under title II an amount equal to 1 percent of any wages paid to any such individual for services performed in 1939 if taxes on such wages were not paid.) The House recedes.

On amendment No. 36: The House bill exempted from the definition of employment service performed in the employ of an agricultural or horticultural organization. The Senate amendment clarifies this exemption to make certain that these organizations are identical with agricultural and horticultural organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 37 and 38: These amendments make a clarifying change to bring this provision into conformity with a similar provision contained in the Revenue Act of 1939. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 39: This amendment makes a clerical change. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment would exclude fishermen from coverage. It would also exclude officers and members of crews (even though not fishermen) of any vessel less than 400 tons, or of any sail vessel regardless of tonnage if the vessel is engaged in the specified fishing activities. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment which exempts from coverage service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (a) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (b) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than 10 net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States).

On amendment No. 41: This amendment excludes service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in making street sales of newspapers, and in making house-to-house deliveries of newspapers and shopping news, including handbills and other similar types of advertising material. It does not include the handling of newspapers and advertising material prior to the time they are turned over to the individual who makes the sale, the house-to-house, or other final distribution. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 42 and 43: These amendments make a clarifying change. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 44: This amendment places a top limit of \$250 on the average monthly wage upon which computation of the primary insurance benefit may be based. It will be impossible to exceed this average from employment after 1939 due to Senate amendment No. 27; nevertheless, in an occasional case a person earning large amounts with several employers, prior to 1940 and retiring in the near future, might otherwise receive unjustifiably large benefits. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 45: This amendment provides that the minimum primary insurance benefit shall be \$10. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52: The House bill set up an "average monthly wage" formula in terms of years. These Senate amendments set up such formula in terms of quarters. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 53: This amendment is complementary to amendment No. 35 and excludes from the divisor in determining the average monthly wage of an individual any quarter, after the quarter in which he attained age 65, occurring prior to 1939. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 54: This amendment is complementary to amendments Nos. 46 to 52. The House bill defined the term "fully insured individual" in terms of years and years of coverage. The House bill provided that in any case where an individual had at least 15 years of coverage he would always be a fully insured individual. The Senate amendment defined such term in quarters and quarters of coverage. It also provides that where an individual had at least 40 quarters of coverage (10 years) he would always be a fully insured individual. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 55 and 56: The House bill defined the term "wife" to mean a wife of an individual who was married to him prior to January 1, 1939, or, if later, prior to the date upon which he attained the age of 60; and defined the term "widow" (except when used in sec. 202 (g)) to mean the surviving dependent wife of an individual who was married to him prior to the beginning of the twelfth month before the month in which he died. These Senate amendments eliminate the requirement as to the date of marriage in any case where the wife is the mother of a son or daughter of the insured individual. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 57 and 58: The House bill defined agricultural labor to include all services performed on a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity. These Senate amendments struck out the words "connection with." The conference action restores such words; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 59, 60, 62, 63, and 66: These amendments make clarifying changes to the definition of agricultural labor. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 61: This amendment includes in the definition of agricultural labor service performed on a farm with respect to other wildlife in the same manner and to the same extent as service performed with respect to fur-bearing animals. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

On amendment No. 64: This amendment includes within the term "agricultural labor" service performed in the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the maintenance of the tools and equipment on such farm. It also includes service performed in the employ of any such owner, tenant, or other operator in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush or other debris left by a hurricane. Both amendments are subject to the limitation contained in the bill that the major part of such service must be performed on a farm. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 65: This amendment includes as agricultural labor, in addition to the services included in the House bill, service performed in connection with the operation or maintenance of

ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farming purposes. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: This amendment is similar to amendment No. 2. The House bill stated that the Board should make no certification for payment to any State under title III of the Social Security Act unless it found that the law of such State approved by the Board included provision for such methods of administration (other than those relating to selection, tenure of office, and compensation of personnel) as are found by the Board to be reasonably calculated to insure full payment of unemployment compensation when due. The Senate amendment struck out the parenthetical clause and inserted a new parenthetical clause which provides that after July 1, 1941, such methods of administration shall include methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but changes the date therein from July 1, 1941, to January 1, 1940, and provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 68: This amendment provides for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis similar to amendments Nos. 2 and 67. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 69: The House bill increased from one-third to one-half the Federal share of the sums expended in a State for aid to dependent children. The House bill retained the provisions of existing law with respect to the amounts above which the Federal Government would not contribute, namely, \$18 a month for the first dependent child and \$12 a month with respect to each of the other dependent children. The Senate amendment retained the increase of the share of the Federal contribution from one-third to one-half and changed the existing law by eliminating the present maxima and providing that the Federal share would be based on an average of \$18 multiplied by the total number of dependent children receiving aid for the month. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 70: The House bill amended the definition of the term "dependent child" to include children between the ages of 16 and 18 if found by the State agency to be regularly attending school. Present law includes only children under the age of 16. The Senate amendment includes nonremunerated apprentices in the same class as children regularly attending school with respect to the liberalization of the age limitation. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 71: This amendment makes a clerical change. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 72: This amendment increases the authorization of appropriations for grants to States for maternal and child health services for each fiscal year from \$3,800,000 to \$5,820,000. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 73: This amendment increases the amount authorized to be allotted to the various States in the proportion that live births bear to the total number of live births in the United States, from \$1,800,000 to \$2,800,000. The amendment also increases the amount authorized to be allotted according to the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan from \$980,000 to \$1,980,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 74: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 75: This amendment provides for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis similar to amendments Nos. 2, 67, and 68. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 76: This amendment increases the authorization of appropriations for grants to States for services to crippled children for each fiscal year from \$2,850,000 to \$3,870,000. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 77: This amendment amends section 512 of the Social Security Act by designating the existing law as subsection (a) and inserting therein the amount (\$1,830,000) to be allotted thereunder in addition to the flat allotments of \$20,000 for each State (including Puerto Rico). The additional amount is allotted to the States on the basis of the need of each State taking into consideration the number of crippled children in each State in need of services for crippled children and the cost of furnishing such services. These sums are to be allotted on a matching basis. The additional appropriation of \$1,000,000 is to be allotted under a new subsection (b) according to the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The States are not required to match allotments from this latter appropriation. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 78: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 79: This amendment provides for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis similar to amendments Nos. 2, 67, 68, and 75. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with

respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 80: This amendment makes a clarifying change in section 514 (a) of the Social Security Act. It also adds a new subsection (c) to such section 514 to provide the method of paying the additional amount to be allotted under amendment No. 77. The amendment also increases the authorization for child-welfare services from \$1,500,000 to \$1,510,000 so that Puerto Rico may share equally with the States. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 81 and 82: The House bill increased the authorization for vocational rehabilitation from \$1,938,000 to \$2,938,000. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision in the House bill and inserted a provision increasing such authorization to \$4,000,000. The amendment also provides that the minimum allotment for any State shall be \$30,000 instead of \$10,000 as provided in existing law, and provides an annual flat allotment to Hawaii and Puerto Rico of \$15,000. The amendment also increases the authorization of appropriations for administrative expenses for vocational rehabilitation from \$102,000 to \$150,000. The House recedes with an amendment which increases the authorization for vocational rehabilitation to \$3,500,000 instead of \$4,000,000; places Puerto Rico in the same status as a State (see also amendment No. 166); and increases the minimum allotment for any State from \$10,000 to \$20,000 instead of \$30,000.

On amendment No. 83: This amendment increases the authorization of appropriations for each fiscal year for grants to States and other political subdivisions for public-health work from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment increasing such authorization to \$11,000,000 instead of \$12,000,000.

On amendment No. 84: This amendment makes a clerical change, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 85: Under existing law, remuneration received by an employee with respect to employment during any calendar year is taxable up to and including \$3,000 received by the employee from each employer he may have during the year. Hence, an employee who has more than one employer may be required to pay the old-age insurance employees' tax on aggregate wages in excess of \$3,000. The Senate amendment permits the employee to obtain a refund, without interest, of the tax paid on the aggregate in excess of \$3,000 earned after December 31, 1939, provided a timely claim is filed. This amendment is complementary to amendment No. 27. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 86 and 87: These amendments exclude from the definition of wages payments made by an employer under certain conditions on behalf of his employees on account of death (including life insurance) where it is clear that the employee, while living, does not have certain rights and options. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 89: The House bill exempted from the definition of employment service performed in the employ of an agricultural or horticultural organization. The Senate amendment clarifies this exemption to make certain that these organizations are identical with agricultural and horticultural organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 90 and 91: These amendments make a clarifying change to bring this provision into conformity with a similar provision contained in the Revenue Act of 1939. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 92: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 93: This amendment would exclude fishermen from coverage. It would also exclude officers and members of crews (even though not fishermen) of any vessel less than 400 tons, or of any sail vessel regardless of tonnage if the vessel is engaged in the specified fishing activities. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment which exempts from coverage service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as an ordinary incident to any such activity), except (a) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (b) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than 10 net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States).

On amendment No. 94: This amendment excludes service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in making street sales of newspapers, and in making house-to-house deliveries of newspapers and shopping news, including handbills and other similar types of advertising material. It does not include the handling of newspapers and advertising material prior to the time they are turned over to the individual who makes the sale, the house-to-house, or other final distribution. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 95 and 96: These amendments make a clarifying change; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 97 and 98: The House bill extended coverage to certain salesmen who are not employees. The Senate

amendment strikes out this extension of coverage and also strikes out the new definition of employer as such definition was rendered unnecessary if the extension of coverage to such salesmen is not retained in the bill. It is believed inexpedient to change the existing law which limits coverage to employees. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 99, 100, 101, and 102: These amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 103 and 104: The House bill defined agricultural labor to include all services performed on a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity. These Senate amendments struck out the words "connection with." The conference action restores such words; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 105, 106, 108, 109, and 112: These amendments make clarifying changes to the definition of agricultural labor. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 107: This amendment includes in the definition of agricultural labor service performed on a farm with respect to other wildlife in the same manner and to the same extent as service performed with respect to fur-bearing animals. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

On amendment No. 110: This amendment includes within the term "agricultural labor" service performed in the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the maintenance of the tools and equipment on such farm. It also includes service performed in the employ of any such owner, tenant, or other operator in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush or other debris left by a hurricane. Both amendments are subject to the limitation contained in the bill that the major part of such service must be performed on a farm. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 111: This amendment includes as agricultural labor, in addition to the services included in the House bill, service performed in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farming purposes. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 113 and 114: Under the House bill the additional credit allowance was based upon the amount, if any, by which contributions required to be paid by a taxpayer with respect to the taxable year were less than the contributions such taxpayer would have been required to pay if throughout the taxable year he had been subject under such State law to a rate of 2.7 percent. These Senate amendments were made necessary by reason of amendment No. 126 which eliminates the new section 1602 (b) of the code contained in the House bill. These amendments base the additional credit allowance on the difference between the amount of contributions the taxpayer was required to pay under the State law and the amount he would have paid if throughout the taxable year he had been subject to the highest rate applied under the State law in the taxable year to any employer, or to a rate of 2.7 percent, whichever is lower. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 115: The House bill amended section 1602 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code by adding a new standard with respect to allowance of additional credit, which required that, irrespective of the type of fund maintained under the State law, such law must contain provisions whereby variations in rates of contributions has between different employers will be so computed as to yield, with respect to each year, a total amount of contributions substantially equivalent to 2.7 percent of the total of pay rolls of employers subject to the contribution requirements of the State law. The Senate amendment deletes this new standard. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125: These amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 117 and 118: Under the House bill, States which have pooled fund unemployment compensation laws would have been allowed to vary rates of contributions and allow reduced rates of contributions on the basis of 3 years of experience by an employer with respect to unemployment or other factors bearing a direct relation to unemployment risk. The Senate amendments change the 3 years to 2 years and further provide that such reduction under pooled fund laws will be allowed only after compensation has been payable under the State law with respect to such employer for the 2 consecutive years immediately preceding the computation date. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 126: The House bill added a new subsection (b) to section 1602 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under this subsection a State would have been permitted to adopt either of two alternative courses of action if its law met the standards set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of the new subsection: (1) It might reduce all employers' rates uniformly; or (2) it might vary individual employers' rates of contributions under experience rating provisions which complied with the applicable standards in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) of such section 1602, but without so calculating the respective rates as to secure an annual yield of an amount substantially equivalent to 2.7 percent of the State pay roll. The Senate amendment deletes this new subsection. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, and 136: These amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 137 and 138: Under the House bill the term "balance" was defined to make clear that the amount of the reserve required to be accumulated by employers with respect to

whom a reserve account or a guaranteed employment account is maintained, is to be made up of payments by such employers and may not be made up of employee contributions or funds from other sources. The exception contained in this definition, which permits the inclusion within a "balance" of payments other than payments by employers if made to a reserve account or guaranteed employment account prior to January 2, 1939, is designed to relieve the States of complicated computations where payments, other than payments by employers, had been paid to such accounts during the early months of the State's experience. These Senate amendments advance the date 1 year beyond that prescribed in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 139: Subsection (b) of section 610 of the House bill, which is deleted by this amendment, has been rendered unnecessary because of Senate amendment No. 115 which deleted from the House bill the average 2.7 percent contribution rate requirement. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 140: The House bill conferred on State legislatures the authority to require instrumentalities of the United States, except those wholly owned by the United States or exempt from the taxes imposed by section 1410 or 1600 of the Internal Revenue Code, to comply with State unemployment compensation laws. The Senate amendment strikes out the reference to the old-age tax imposed by section 1410 since only the unemployment tax imposed by section 1600 is involved. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 141: This is a clarifying amendment to make clear that in determining whether a person employs eight or more employees, only those employees employed in employment (as defined in sec. 1607 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code) are to be counted. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 142 and 143: These amendments exclude from the definition of wages payments made by an employer under certain conditions on behalf of his employees on account of death (including life insurance) where it is clear that the employee, while living, does not have certain rights and options. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 144: The House bill exempted from the definition of employment service performed in the employ of an agricultural or horticultural organization. The Senate amendment clarifies this exemption to make certain that these organizations are identical with agricultural and horticultural organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 145 and 146: These amendments make a clarifying change to bring this provision into conformity with a similar provision contained in the Revenue Act of 1939. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 147 and 148: These amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 149: This amendment eliminates from the Federal Unemployment Tax Act insurance agents and solicitors if the remuneration for which they perform their services is on a commission basis solely. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 150: This amendment excludes service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in making street sales of newspapers, and in making house-to-house deliveries of newspapers and shopping news, including handbills and other similar types of advertising material. It does not include the handling of newspapers and advertising material prior to the time they are turned over to the individual who makes the sale, the house-to-house, or other final distribution. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 151 and 152: These amendments make a clarifying change; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 153 and 154: The House bill defined agricultural labor to include all services performed on a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity. These Senate amendments struck out the words "connection with." The conference action restores such words; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 155, 156, 158, 159, and 162: These amendments make clarifying changes to the definition of agricultural labor. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 157: This amendment includes in the definition of agricultural labor service performed on a farm with respect to other wildlife in the same manner and to the same extent as service performed with respect to fur-bearing animals. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

On amendment No. 160: This amendment includes within the term "agricultural labor" service performed in the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the maintenance of the tools and equipment on such farm. It also includes service performed in the employ of any such owner, tenant, or other operator in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush or other debris left by a hurricane. Both amendments are subject to the limitation contained in the bill that the major part of such service must be performed on a farm. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 161: This amendment includes as agricultural labor, in addition to the services included in the House bill, service performed in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farming purposes. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 163: This amendment provides for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis similar to amendments Nos. 2, 67, 68, 75, and 79. The House recedes with an amendment which retains the Senate amendment but provides that the Social Security Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods.

On amendment No. 164: The House bill provided as in existing law that the amount to be contributed by the Federal Government for administrative expenses for aid to the blind would be an amount equal to 5 percent of the Federal contribution to the State for aid to the blind. The Senate amendment changes this provision to one-half of the total of the sums expended during any quarter as are found necessary by the Board for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan. The House recedes with conforming amendments.

On amendment No. 165: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 166: The House bill included Puerto Rico on the same basis as a State for the purposes of titles V and VI of the Social Security Act. The Senate amendment (which is complementary to amendment No. 82 giving Puerto Rico \$15,000 annually for vocational rehabilitation) provides that Puerto Rico shall not be included as a State for purposes of vocational rehabilitation grants. The Senate recedes. The conference action on this amendment and amendment No. 82 has the effect of including Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of vocational rehabilitation grants thereby allowing it to receive the minimum allotment of \$20,000 for each fiscal year and to share in the remainder of the appropriation on an equal basis with the States.

On amendment No. 167: This amendment is complementary to amendments Nos. 97 and 98. Under section 606 of the House bill certain salesmen were included as employees for purposes of the old-age insurance tax, and by section 801 were included as employees for the purpose of receiving benefits under title II. Senate amendments Nos. 97 and 98 struck out such extension of coverage for purposes of the tax and this amendment strikes out such extension for purposes of the benefits under title II. It is believed inexpedient to change the existing law which limits coverage to employees. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 168: This amendment, which is complementary to amendment No. 169, makes a clerical change; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 169: This amendment prohibits the Social Security Board from disapproving any State plan under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act on the ground that such plan does not apply to or include certain Indians as defined. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 170: This is a technical amendment made necessary because the new section 906 (amendment No. 174) affects the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and is therefore in conflict with the language contained in section 901 unless this amendment is inserted. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 171: This is a technical amendment to set at rest certain conflicting district court decisions, and provides that the collection of the full 3-percent Federal tax (without allowance of the 90-percent credit) from a bankrupt estate, which failed to qualify for credit, is not prohibited by section 57j of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, which section provides that debts owing to the United States as a penalty or forfeiture shall not be allowed. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 172: This amendment merely conforms the reference in section 1428 of the Internal Revenue Code to the revision of the numbers of the paragraphs in section 1426 (b) of such code. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 173: This amendment is complementary to amendment No. 35 and imposes the old-age insurance tax on wages paid after December 31, 1938, with respect to employment after such date, to employees who have attained the age of 65. It provides that the liability of the employer for the employees' tax with respect to service performed prior to the enactment of this act is limited to the amount of remuneration of such employee in the control of the employer at any time on or after 90 days after the enactment of this act. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 174: This amendment extends the time within which certain States may effect the transfer of certain funds from the State's account in the unemployment trust fund to the railroad unemployment-insurance account in the unemployment trust fund. This postponement will not deprive the railroad unemployment-insurance account of any moneys to which it is entitled under the present provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 175: This amendment is complementary to amendments Nos. 35 and 173. It provides that where the employees' tax with respect to the year 1939 has not been deducted from the employee over 65 and where the employer has not paid the employee's tax for such employee's employment in 1939, deduction of an amount equal to the employee's tax, without interest, would be made from his monthly benefits or other benefits payable with respect to his wages. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 176: This amendment authorizes the establishment of an advisory council on unemployment insurance to study certain specified matters concerning unemployment insurance and make a report thereon. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 177: This amendment authorizes the establishment of an advisory council on disability insurance to make a study of disability insurance and report thereon. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 178: This is a clarifying amendment to make certain that the administration of the functions of the Social Security Board, which was transferred to the Federal Security Agency under reorganization plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress on April 25, 1939, will be administered in the same manner as the other agencies transferred to the Federal Security Agency. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 179: This amendment extends coverage to individuals employed by certain Federal savings and loan associations affiliated with the Federal home loan banks, who would otherwise be excluded from the old-age insurance benefits, the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, since under the Home Owners' Loan Act they are exempt from taxes imposed by the United States. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 180: This amendment relates to section 213 (f) of the Revenue Act of 1939, which deals with the assumption of liability in certain tax-free exchanges. There is no comparable provision in the House bill. Section 213 (f) of the Revenue Act of 1939 retroactively amended the Revenue Acts of 1924 through 1938 to provide that the assumption of a liability or the acquisition of property subject to a liability in certain tax-free exchanges should not result in gain to be taxed at the time of the exchange, except in cases where by a previous decision of a court or of the Board of Tax Appeals, or under a closing agreement, gain was recognized to the transferor of property in the tax-free exchange by reason of such an assumption or acquisition by the transferee. The Senate amendment removes from that exception a case in which gain was recognized to a corporate transferor by a court or Board decision, the basis to the transferee of the property acquired by it in the exchange was fixed at cost under the applicable revenue act, and the corporate taxpayer liquidated immediately subsequent to the exchange. As the period of limitations may have expired with respect to the filing of a refund claim in such a case, the amendment provides 1 year from the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1939 within which to file a refund claim. The House recedes with an amendment which provides that no interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any overpayment refunded or credited by reason of the provisions of this section.

On amendment No. 181: This amendment extends the time to December 31, 1939, for the filing of claims for refunds under subsection (d) of section 602 of the Revenue Act of 1936, as amended. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 182: This amendment provides that after 1940 the provisions of the Social Security Act shall not be applicable to foreign-born aliens. It also provides for refunds of any taxes they may have paid under such act, and that any employer using alien labor shall pay a special privilege tax equivalent to that collected from American citizens. Subsection (b) of the amendment prohibits the payment of any old-age insurance benefit to any individual while such individual is not a resident of the United States or its possessions unless such individual resides within 50 miles of the United States. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

The managers on the part of the House desire to state that the changes made by this bill with respect to agricultural labor do not take effect until January 1, 1940, and therefore have no effect whatsoever on any litigation now in the courts with respect to what constitutes agricultural labor under present law.

The managers on the part of the House also desire to state that there are two very important proposals to which the conferees gave a great deal of attention. These are the so-called Connally amendment, providing for greater Federal matching in the case of old-age assistance, and the Massachusetts plan which would enable the States to make a State-wide reduction in unemployment compensation contribution rates under certain conditions. The conferees believe that a comprehensive study of the subject matter covered by these two proposals should be undertaken which will enable the Congress to deal more intelligently with the problems involved than is possible at the present time.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
THOS. H. CULLEN,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
JERE COOPER,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
FRANK CROWTHER,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6635), an act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. RAYBURN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this statement, of course, will be printed in the RECORD. It is technical, it is 21 pages in length. I believe the House is not getting a great deal out of listening to its reading. I therefore ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have reached a full and complete agreement on the amendments which were in disagreement between the House and the Senate to the social-security bill, H. R. 6635.

The Senate adopted 182 amendments to the social-security bill as it passed the House. Many of these amendments were of a clerical and typographical nature, the changing of section numbers to make the bill comport with final action, and were not very important.

The conferees have given careful and painstaking study to all the amendments adopted by the Senate in order that a workable and intelligent solution of the differences between the House and the Senate might be reached. The conferees were in session 21 days. I have never known conferees to work more assiduously, more unselfishly, or more determinedly to bring back to their respective Houses a report that would be worthy of the subject under consideration and would be the best possible solution of the points in disagreement between the two Houses.

The Committee on Ways and Means also gave this bill, as you all know, long and careful study before it was reported to the House, and the bill was fully explained to the House at the time of its consideration by this body.

As to the amendments that have been added by the Senate, most of them have been explained in the statement that has just been read by the Clerk. If there is any question as to any of them, especially the important and major amendments, some of us will be glad to make the best explanation we can.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the longer a man is a Member of the House the more impressed he becomes with the fact that important legislation is the result of compromise.

The gentleman from North Carolina has referred to the long and tedious sessions the conferees have had on this very important bill; and it is a great pleasure to the minority members of the conference to be in hearty accord with the majority in signing the report, as we have today. [Applause.]

Most of the controversy was over a Senate amendment which the House had previously rejected by a 2-to-1 vote, namely, the proposal that the Federal Government put up \$2 to \$1 of the first \$15 for old-age pensions. That controversy has finally been settled in accordance with the previous action of the House. On other amendments there was, of course, a great deal of give and take, as there necessarily had to be.

I am very sorry to find that it is necessary at this time to eliminate from the bill what is known as the Massachusetts plan, making possible a reduction in the unemployment tax. I wish some compromise could have been reached on this

particular detail; but it is not dead—it is simply resting until some future action on the part of the House takes place.

The most important result of the conference, as I see it, is to make possible the freezing of the pay-roll tax at 1 percent for the next 3 years. This will save something like \$275,000,000 to employers and employees during 1940.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield, certainly.

Mr. COOPER. That, of course, is for the year 1940 only.

Mr. TREADWAY. One year.

Mr. COOPER. It is frozen at that figure for 3 years.

Mr. TREADWAY. The freezing of the rate will be in effect for 3 years. The saving during this time will be \$825,000,000.

The gentleman is correct. I was referring simply to the year 1940.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And also the freezing of the unemployment pay-roll tax on the first \$3,000 results in a saving of \$65,000,000?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which is permanent. There is no limitation on that?

Mr. TREADWAY. I was coming to that. Then the provision relieving employers of the 90-percent penalty under the unemployment tax involves a saving for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of \$15,000,000 in addition.

I think the House can be well pleased with the results that the conferees on the part of the House have been able to secure. While it has been a very long and tedious process, as I previously said, nevertheless, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is most heartily to be congratulated for the success of the conference, and I hope the conference report will be adopted by unanimous vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the conference report will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members on both sides of the House for this expression of confidence and approval of the work of the conference committee. I feel I would be derelict in my duty, a very pleasant one, I assure you, if I did not express my thanks and appreciation to not only each member of the House conferees but especially to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who has labored faithfully and unselfishly, even to the extent of foregoing a trip abroad, in order that he might remain at his post and discharge his duty. [Applause.] I especially extend my thanks to him for the fine service he has rendered in connection with the work of the conferees on this important measure.

NATIONAL CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2240) to provide for a national census of housing.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2240 with Mr. GAVAGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us simply provides that when the census is taken next year there shall

be included among those things to be enumerated a census of housing conditions in the United States. I do not want to make an extended argument to the Members of the House, but I do want them to understand on what they are voting because I have a feeling that more of us are acting on this as a matter of prejudice than from information about the measure now pending. Certainly if this measure were one calculated, as some have suggested this afternoon, simply to be a back door into what we refused to do yesterday, the committee would have done well to have cast about to get someone else to come before you this afternoon. I voted against the housing bill yesterday afternoon. I did not feel that we had adequate information then, and we have not today, to know whether we need \$8,000,000 or \$800,000,000. I did not feel that we had any evidence which would justify our embarking on a program of that size. My vote was not dictated by any desire to break-down a program of slum clearance or housing for the destitute, because I believe in that program. I feel, however, that the Government should never embark upon an \$800,000,000 program without knowing where it is going and where we are likely to come out. We do not know these things now.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that there have already been about 300 surveys in various city areas on the housing situation?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I certainly would not challenge it if the gentleman makes it as a statement. I know there have been a number of surveys made, a number of guesses, and a number of estimates made in a number of cities of the United States. I know that there is no accurate information anywhere in the United States as to housing conditions in this Nation today. I know there are no accurate figures. There have been some guesses, there have been some estimates, and there have been some chambers of commerce tell us that their towns are superior to every other city in the Nation, but there are not actual figures. We do not know what the housing situation is in the United States. We do not know whether we are embarking on a sound program or not. We are spending the Government's money in total blindness. We do not know in which direction we are going, and it seems to me we would do well to at least get accurate facts and figures upon which to base an expenditure of larger sums of money, if these larger sums should be spent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I have not very much time. I will yield if I can complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know at this time how the United States compares with other nations. We have no idea what the requirements for future years may be.

We have no way of telling what we can expect in the way of private building 10 years from now, 5 years from now, or 2 years from now. We do not know how many people are going to need houses at some future time. There is no way of actually determining what will be the trend in business, and that does not simply mean some social experiment; that means we do not know the trend which the investments of money in this country are going to take.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. You talk about this thing being some wild and untried theory. We certainly are just as much entitled to know the trend of housing, which is one of the largest enterprises in this Nation, as we are to know the amount of cotton that is produced. Certainly we in my section of the country want to know that, and we do find it out through the Bureau of the Census today. Certainly it is just as important that we know what to expect in the housing industry as it is to know what to expect in the shoe industry, yet the Bureau of the Census finds out how many shoes we are producing. Let us do for a great industry, one of the greatest industries in the Nation, the

building industry, what we have long properly done for many industries that do not approach it in importance. We took a census 10 years ago of the radios in our homes. Important; good; I am for it. We ought to know it. But the radio industry, important as it has become, is of small importance as compared with the great housing industry of this Nation, one of the most important endeavors of private business, and we know nothing about it.

We do not ask that you give us a complete, separate census. We do not ask that you have another set-up. We do not ask that you conduct a regular census and then another one. We simply ask that when you take the 1940 census you include therein questions that will enable the builder of the future to know what may reasonably be expected 5 or 10 years from now. This involves slum clearance, yes; but it also involves the reserve on your life insurance policy, it involves the value of every security in the United States that is based upon homes as security.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. All the gentleman desires is that this survey be included in the next census when that census is taken?

Mr. POAGE. That is all we are asking.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman feels that it is justifiable and needed, and will actually be helpful?

Mr. POAGE. I do feel that it will be a wise expenditure of money at this time. It can be done cheaper next year than at any other time. The bill authorizes \$8,000,000, but I am sure that it will cost much less. I feel that before you embark upon any great program it is wise to carry on a survey and let your engineers and your architects get the facts. Let the Census Bureau get the facts.

I want to explain just one point that was discussed a few moments ago, and point out that when we take this census, the United States Bureau of the Census does not have, never has had, and under this bill has no authority to make public the private returns of any individual. All you will get will be the sum total, so that we may know the trend, so that we may know the facts; but these returns cannot be used, as someone has suggested, as a sucker list whereby any individual can find out whether John Jones has three rooms and Henry Smith has five. There will be no separate information coming from this census that can be used against any single individual. It will be the composite sum total of all the information, just as all the rest of the Census Bureau figures are and always have been. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, every time a fellow turns around in the Capitol he bumps into a new blueprint of some Roosevelt housing program.

During the last 6 years no subject has been discussed more eloquently, or in larger figures. Since 1933 Government loans and expenditures for public housing and subsidized home ownership have aggregated roundly \$5,000,000,000, exclusive of private loans guaranteed by the Government. Wisely and soundly spent, this would have provided a million new homes at \$5,000 each.

But what has been the net result of all these scattered programs? Are the working people as a group better housed throughout the Nation? That is the real test, and today the official figures are available.

A survey published by the Department of Commerce shows that during the 6 New Deal years, 1933-38, new dwellings built in the entire United States averaged 204,000 a year. But during the corresponding years of the previous decade—that is for the years 1923-28—the average number of new dwellings built every year in the entire country was 807,000. Thus the New Deal record is 603,000 fewer homes built every year, or 3,618,000 fewer homes for the 6 years compared.

Here we have a fair picture of what all the Roosevelt demagoguery about housing really means to the people who need the homes.

The tables which follow, taken from the Commerce Department's official report, tell the whole story. They convert all types of home construction, public and private, into one-family units. First, let us look at home building under the New Deal:

New dwellings built in the United States

1933	64,000
1934	59,000
1935	138,000
1936	275,000
1937	327,000
1938	360,000
Total for 6 New Deal years	1,223,000
Average built each year	203,833

And now, let us see what happened before Roosevelt began to throw money to the four winds. Here is the home-building record for the corresponding years of the previous decade:

New dwellings built in United States

1923	814,000
1924	827,000
1925	894,000
1926	841,000
1927	757,000
1928	713,000
Total for 6 Republican years	4,846,000
Average built each year	807,666

These figures show that the difference between Republican policies and New Deal programs, as measured in new dwellings actually made available for occupancy by the people, is, in round numbers, an average of 603,000 homes a year—or a total of 3,618,000 for the six New Deal years to date.

Had Roosevelt encouraged solid business recovery to the average level of the Republican years, there would have been built since 1933 some 3,618,000 more new dwellings than actually have been built under all the screwball ventures of the "brain trust."

It is obvious that this New Deal deficiency of 3,618,000 new homes over a period of 6 years means only one thing—a generally lowered standard of living for the Nation.

With our population increasing at the rate of approximately 1,500,000 each year, and with an accumulated Roosevelt shortage of more than 3,600,000 dwellings during the last 6 years, we begin to glimpse the crippling effects of all these official brain storms regarding housing.

Under responsible Republican policies, confident private enterprise supplied our people with an average of 807,000 new dwellings every year; but under the squaderlust experiments of the New Deal our steadily increasing population gets only 204,000 new houses a year—and even those are encumbered by unseen mortgages amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, representing the burden added to the public debt every year to support Roosevelt's so-called housing program.

The net result is a mountain of new debt for housing—and 3,600,000 fewer houses built in 6 years.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said that this question was being decided on a matter of prejudice and lack of information. I agree with that statement, and I predict that the bill will pass.

As originally reported from the Senate, this bill was a bill to aid the housing program of the United States. This is the language that appeared in the Senate bill, which this committee took out, in reference to this housing census:

Concerning the social and economic characteristics of their ownership and use, necessary to aid in the formulation of a national housing program and in the administration of housing legislation.

The Senate bill also provided that this should be a separate census, a separate schedule, a separate piece of paper, if you please. It was estimated by the Senate that there are 35,000,000 family units in the United States. On the basis of 25 cents per schedule, the cost would be \$8,500,000. The House Committee on the Census thought they had accomplished a great deal when they struck out the language

referred to and authorized the taking of this census along with the regular census. However, in a telephone conversation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census while the committee hearings were in progress, he said that that would reduce the expense only \$500,000 below the previous authorization of \$8,500,000.

I submit there is no information available about this bill, but I am able to figure a little. It would cost \$8,500,000 to take a census calling for a separate schedule of 35,000,000 units, but if it was combined with the census that is being taken anyway, the only additional cost would be when they had to make out a schedule for a vacant house. If we have vacancies of 20 percent—and I do not know how much it is, but if it is 20 percent—at 25 cents per schedule, the cost would be \$1,750,000 instead of \$8,000,000.

At the time this proceeding was had in the Census Committee the Director of the Bureau of the Census was not present. Immediately upon the adjournment of the committee I wrote Mr. Austin a letter, as follows:

The Committee on the Census this morning reported out S. 2240, as amended, as shown by the enclosed copy which I am sending you.

I was one of the members that for the present opposed this measure, and I should like to have this information concerning this bill.

If this measure becomes a law, I would like to have a copy of your proposed schedule of questions that will be propounded to secure this information. In other words, I am anxious to know the extent of the census on housing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. In just a moment.

The Director of the Census was not there; we had no opportunity to find out what we were authorizing at that time. It was clear that it was part of the housing program, plus the information inserted by the gentleman from Mississippi in regard to utility equipment.

A few days later I received a reply from the Director of the Census, and I will read a portion of it for your information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I read a portion of the letter:

Among the more important items which would probably be considered for inclusion in a housing census are the following:

1. Structural items: Type of structure, number of dwelling units, and year built;
2. Dwelling-unit items: Occupancy or tenure, duration of occupancy or vacancy, number of rooms, running water, toilet and bathing facilities, central heat, fuel, and monthly rental; and
3. For owner-occupied structures: Owner's estimate of value, amount of real-estate taxes and special assessments, and mortgage status.

He further says:

The exact questions to be asked in each of these fields can only be determined after careful study of the language of the act and of the relative needs of business, industry, and Government for detailed Nation-wide information on these various subjects.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wish to make the following observation: There has been some question about the adequacy of some of these surveys. Secretary Wallace, testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee at the hearings on the housing bill, had this to say:

I might say on the need—

That is, of housing—

we have some very complete figures as to the need in different States based on a very comprehensive survey.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have that for the record.

That is placed in the record and shows the number of bathrooms, the percent of water-piped houses, the percent of indoor toilets, the percent having no screens, inadequate screens, painted, and inadequately painted for all the States of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the most important single fact about this housing census proposition is that if it is taken all by itself it will cost about \$16,000,000 to do it. If it is taken in conjunction with the regular census, as this bill provides, the additional cost will be only a very small fraction of that figure.

Now, all I want to say in these 3 minutes is this. The fact that a majority of the House chose to vote down the housing bill yesterday, unfortunately, is not equivalent, as some gentlemen seem to think, to doing away with the bad housing conditions and slums that obtain in certain parts of this country. We may fail to act here; but our failure to act does not wipe out the reasons why we should have acted. I hope we are not going to see more than a very small, scattering number of votes against this proposition. Surely, Members are not going to carry their unwillingness to face honestly the broad and important social problems of this country to the place where we do not even want to get information regarding them. The obvious purpose of this proposal is that we have thorough information upon which to act.

I do not know what will be found out from this study, but I do know that I want to have as full information as I can upon which to proceed and upon which to base such future action as I may take.

I believe it certainly would not be too much to say that this Congress has turned down a very great deal of meritorious legislation, sometimes, perhaps, due to misunderstanding and due to the fact that the full information regarding the question was not possessed by certain Members. It appears to me in these closing days that, at least, we can take steps so that we can have information on one of the most important problems that there is in this Nation, the problem of millions of our people living under conditions where the rearing of children in decency and in health is tremendously difficult, to say the very least. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, supplementing the remarks I made this afternoon, I wish to say that the language of this bill requires that we shall take the census, that we shall investigate the homes and equipment, and not the characteristics of the equipment. We formerly thought that our houses were our castles. The investigator evidently is required to visit all of the rooms and report on the characteristics. I suggest that they might find conditions such that the soap manufacturers might be informed that a particular district would provide good business for the soap manufacturer, and I use that as illustrative of all business. I think that is going very far. There is a definite requirement—the word is “shall.”

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am on the committee, and at first I was not in agreement with the conditions of this bill, due largely to the matter of the valuation of homes. I took the matter up with the Director of the Census, and he said that, so far as the column on valuation shown on these homes is concerned, it will be shown as the owner's own valuation. The Director of the Census, Mr. Austin, has been taking censuses for 40 years. I think that he knows the information that we should get in this census, and it is largely on his recommendation I am going to ask for the passage of this bill.

Referring to the \$800,000,000 housing bill which was defeated yesterday, I might say, incidentally, that I never looked on that as a housing bill, but always called it a “hosing” program, and I have always said that the taxpayers of the country would get the greatest “hosing,” if that bill passed, that they ever got. Nevertheless, the sum of \$800,000,000 had already been appropriated for a bill of this kind before this other bill came up; and I think that if that money is

going to be spent intelligently that they should have the benefit of the statistics that will be obtained through this bill, and I ask for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER].

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rules defeated on Tuesday and yesterday and I voted for this rule, but I do not like this bill. I do not favor defeating rules to prevent consideration of a bill. When this bill was before the Census Committee, a distinguished member of that committee passed a slip of paper across the table and asked me to move the indefinite postponement of action on the bill. On the occasion when Dr. Austin appeared before our committee, prior to any consideration being given this bill, and when it was suggested on the part of the members of our committee who are also members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that a census of aliens be taken in connection with the regular decennial population census, he opposed the pollution of that census by anything that would impair the integrity of the work of his Bureau, which he says has been built up and established over many years.

His argument was that any departure would impair confidence and shut the door to essential statistics.

Dr. Austin further extolled the integrity of the fifteenth decennial census, saying that one taken in 1930 was the best ever taken, and it was his aim and ambition to improve the census in 1940 over that of 1930. He was disposed to show every indication of opposition to imposing additions to the population census. All personal contacts prior to his appearance negated anything that might be contemplated or undertaken by your committee by way of loading the 1940 census with additional requirements and exactions in its taking.

Dr. Austin attended the committee hearing well fortified with assistants, collaborating with their information on the subject, and at the conclusion of that day's hearings there was not a member among us who did not believe the 1940 census would remain strictly limited to its constitutional population requirement.

On the occasion of the next meeting of the committee, this bill, S. 2240, was taken up for consideration, when a bureaucrat appeared from somewhere, among the denizens of the Department of Commerce or the Bureau of the Census. He was typical; would not be pinned down to any particular.

While he was there to testify and talked and talked he pursued a round robin of personal assurance of his not being qualified to testify, and therefore urging upon the committee the necessity of having the experts from the Housing Authority appear to testify as to the importance and necessity for the enactment provided for under this bill and the authorization for an appropriation of \$8,500,000. He was very steadfast in all assurances he could not testify for the Commerce Department and Bureau of the Census, and was incompetent to testify on the necessity from the standpoint of the Housing Authority. Regardless of the extent of discussion his testimony provoked among the committee members, he always found a way for testifying in the interest of the Housing Authority and disavowing any intent to connect it with the Bureau of the Census. He certainly would not testify to any one position of conclusion. His sole effort and energies were all expended in one direction, viz, that of the justification and perpetuation of bureaucracy in its virulent and most infectious and contagious form, the sole object being to get the attendance of the smoothest bureaucrats the Housing Authority could advance to hold forth and sustain their argument for perpetuation whether it costs \$8,500,000 or any amount greater of course. It was a typical example of bureaucracy's workings. "You scratch my back and I will scratch yours."

As an argument for the proposal, he introduced a letter dated in April 1936, written by Frederic A. Delano, advocating a gathering of a census on housing. I personally

examined this letter, and questioned him on the subject of what action, if any, had been taken on his letter of recommendation, to which he asserted that something over 300 separate censuses on housing had been undertaken and completed as work-relief projects. Pinned down, he admitted that more than two-thirds of this number, or over 200 have been made since the letter suggesting it, was written. He would make no commitment of conclusion as to the necessity for further housing censuses based on findings of such admittedly extended undertakings, but did instantly seize upon the opportunity to point out where they had been taken, evading any conclusion. One ostensible conclusion is palpable if not purposeful, viz, the wanton waste and expenditure of public money, without result or conclusion of record, save this appeal and effort to get an additional \$8,500,000.

This man did make one definite commitment, viz, that the proposed census enumeration form is submitted, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. Now everybody knows that Mr. Hoover, before his selection as Secretary of Commerce, had spent many years in England, where radio receivers have been taxed. Some may recall he was alleged to have advocated it here. After his elevation from Secretary of Commerce to the Presidency, in which high office he was serving when the 1930 census was taken, need anyone doubt where the enumeration of radio receiving sets had its inception? It is this item that prompted the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on all electrical appliances.

I keenly resent that attitude upon the part of the representative of any branch of the Government who appears before a committee of Congress, and I so stated my position. When I moved to indefinitely postpone action on this bill, the vote taken was unanimous. However, thereafter two members asked to be recorded in opposition, and later one member not in attendance also asked to be so recorded.

Within a week thereafter, I was solicited as to my position and proclaiming it unchanged, informed the chairman since the postponement was indefinite, I had no opposition to offer to his conclusion sufficient time had elapsed to consider it again. Very shortly thereafter the bill was again called up before the committee and the letters introduced here today in the debate under the rule, dated as recent as July 24. After this matter was before us, when the question came up for the consideration of the bill, a distinguished member of the committee who is here this afternoon insisted that this should not cost eight and a half million dollars, and he demanded of this particular individual to know whether it consisted of the additional cost of the paper and the ink to be used in the printing of the forms.

Something transpired that I confess that I am not in on. I do not know what happened. There was a change, and I moved in our committee to strike out this authorized appropriation, and let it be done with the \$45,000,000 appropriation for which I had voted, and that is what I believe should be done. I was defeated. If someone will offer that amendment I will support it. If it carries I am not going to vote against the passage of this bill, but if it fails of adoption I am not going to vote in the direction of increasing the cost of a census constitutionally required.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be in the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] who yesterday stated the fact that he had been born in the slums. I happen to have been born in a log house. It was the best that my parents could afford. Today it happens that in the passing of time and the death of my parents and grandparents, the home has become my property.

It is still a log house. It was not equipped with the facilities and accommodations that the people feel we should have now. I became accustomed to it and, as much as I am unaccustomed to the life, I would have to live in that old home; it is still the old homestead, the place where I was born. I do not believe we should be disposed to bureaucratically snoop around and find fault with the particular type

of individual who is content to own what he does. A man's home is still his castle. It is still, in America, a part of American institutions. If we go back into the early history of the Colonies we will recall somewhat of the philosophy of this character that was undertaken in the settlement of North Carolina. It was known as the grand model. I remember it from my school days, because I was tripped on it one time on my first day in State Normal School. The professor came in and instructed me to write about the grand model.

I had not yet been assigned a textbook and had never seen a copy of the history used in that institution. I could only write what I had studied before I matriculated. I did it thus:

The grand model was a scheme advocated by Lord Shaftesbury and the celebrated philosopher John Locke. The model was aristocratic, and the people were democratic, and was doomed to failure. To have made it a success it would have been necessary to transform the log cabins into baronial castles, and the peaceful settlers into armed retainers.

Members of the Committee, as the grand model failed in the settlement of the colony of North Carolina, so its philosophy is unacceptable today. The man with pride in ownership is content with what he possesses and can call his own. He is infinitely more gravely concerned over the expenditures of government than he will ever be interested in the collection of a census on how he lives and where he lives, when he can yet call what he possesses his own. I certainly fear a large-scale grand-model venture if the bureaucrats of the Housing Authority secure census statistics to use as a warrant for their continuation and perpetuation as a bureaucracy, to thereafter spread dissatisfaction and discontent with what our citizens yet possess in the way of homes.

I believe that every man's home is still his castle in America, and that he is entitled to be protected by the Government against having his own domicile pried into by agents of Government snooping and finding a basis of criticism and fault with his environs. They do exactly this with his barn, his cattle, his pigsty and hogs, and his hen house and poultry. With what avarice do greedy eyes propose to pry into his home, kitchen, bedchamber, and bathroom or lack of one?

A childhood schoolmate of mine, on acquiring one of these old homes, having spent some time in the very large cities, decided he needed a bathtub. He installed it in this small country house. Thereupon the assessor increased his assessment on this property \$200 for the improvement. Not for 1 year, but for a triennial period of 3 years, and thereafter for all time. Have a care lest we do go too far. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill, S. 2240, passed the Senate June 23, providing for a national housing census in conjunction with, at the same time, and as a part of the sixteenth decennial census.

The Census Committee of the House on July 13, after hearing representatives from the Bureau of the Census and, after full consideration, unanimously voted to table action on the bill at this session.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINZER. I yield.

Mr. DUNN. The gentleman is in error because it was not unanimous. I was one of a number who voted the other way.

Mr. KINZER. I did not know that. I think we did not hear your name.

Mr. POAGE. I voted against that.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, to correct the RECORD, I will say the chairman of the committee, Mr. DUNN, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] wanted to be recorded as voting "no." Among the absentees there was another member of the committee who came in subsequently and asked to be recorded as "no."

Mr. KINZER. Then I stand corrected. I thought it was unanimous.

In the fifteenth decennial census various subjects were added in conjunction with the census of the population in-

cluding retail and wholesale distribution, amusements, hotels, manufactories, irrigation, drainage, mining, and so forth.

With all these other subjects, the census was handled efficiently and satisfactorily. It would not involve much more trouble to learn the sort of house a man lives in.

In 1935 the agricultural census included the number of occupied farmhouses and vacant farm dwellings. It also included a census having to do with mortgages, taxes, and crops.

The Government has been gathering data on housing ever since I have been a Member of this body.

The man in the rural community lives in a house he can afford. What contribution can be made to the comfort and aid of our people by the knowledge of whether his home contains the latest plumbing, electrical equipment, hardwood or carpeted floors, electric refrigerator, radio, telephone, and so forth?

A housing census could not be complete without a census of local prevailing living and social conditions, and that could not be done. A house in New York must necessarily be different from a house in Mississippi or Florida, and such a housing census would tend to leave a false impression.

The Housing Authority already has much of this information and a large staff to collect it. Over 300 such specific surveys have been made.

The 1929 Census Law, section 4, gives the Director of the Census, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, the power to determine what shall be included in the census schedule.

The above were some of the reasons for the Census Committee having refused to take action on S. 2240 at its meeting on July 13.

On July 25 a meeting of the Census Committee was again called in executive session, at which time, without hearing further testimony, the bill was reported out with minor changes and carrying with it an authorization for \$3,000,000 for the purpose. No testimony was offered, nor reason for this authorization.

An appropriation has already been made of over forty-five millions for the Sixteenth Decennial Census, twenty-one millions of which is now available for immediate use; and I can see no reason at this time for the expenditure of money called for in the bill.

Until and unless the Federal Housing Act is passed and becomes a law, there certainly is no reason, or, at least, not sufficient reason, for the passage of this bill at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The idea of considering a bill of this importance without a quorum is too much.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GAVAGAN). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to these facts: Our difficulties in legislation are greatly enhanced by the lack of the facts. During the past 6 years we have been talking about unemployment without knowing what we are talking about. Everybody goes out and guesses about the number of people who are unemployed, and nobody knows.

We finally got through a partial census which does throw some light on the subject. From that time until this we have been able to make some rational estimate on that subject, and not before that. We are now talking constantly about one-third of the Americans who are underhoused. I do not know whether it is a third or a half or two-thirds, and neither does anybody else. I would like to know, because this body is not capable of passing rational legislation along certain lines, without this information as the basis of it. If we are well housed we ought to know that and quit talking about the other thing.

Since the gentlemen who are so very much perturbed over the possibility of making somebody dissatisfied with the home

he has, which, of course, is a piece of political imagination, and nothing else, what we are really trying to do is to get the facts about housing before us. I do not see how else we will ever learn anything about it. We are taking a general census at the present time along the line that the Constitution provides. There is no argument against this, because it happens to be new. I want to point out to you that every time we have taken a census we have added something new to that census not asked for before that we ought to have done, because our growth and development has, of course, compelled us as a matter of intelligence to do that sort of thing.

I doubt whether there is any other thing that ought to so much interest this body as the housing of the people of the United States. I am not able, so far as my ability as a student of economics goes, to tell where I am on anything where I have not the facts. If I get the facts, I am quite as capable of making up my own mind as anybody else. I therefore am not only in favor of this bill, but I appeal to the Members of this House to consider it carefully and pass the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I was just wondering. Suppose, peradventure you do find some fellow is ill-housed, what are you going to do about it?

Mr. KELLER. It will depend upon the number, the proportion, and the condition. If you take one instance, of course, I could not legislate on the whole subject of housing on one instance, but I put it back to the gentleman: If one-third of the people are found to be ill-housed I should undoubtedly think that the gentleman himself with his intelligence would try to find some way to remedy that condition.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. But I understand the President has already determined that one-third of the people are ill-housed.

Mr. KELLER. That is what I want to find out. Which third is it, where do they live, why are they badly housed, and how can we help them to better houses? Nobody knows the answer to all this, and nobody can know until we get the facts and correlate them so we can make sense out of it all.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I know it does not apply to my colleague or anyone in the House; nevertheless, it seems to me some people are afraid we may find there is too much housing in certain respects, or that some people have too many houses instead of too few. I know it does not apply to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to reply to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KELLER. I am glad to yield for a question, but not for an argument. The gentleman had his time within which to make his argument.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Is it not a fact that the United States is the only civilized nation in the world that has not yet made an official census on housing and housing conditions?

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. Of all the civilized countries of the world the United States is the only one that does not have adequate and accurate statistics on the housing of its people. Most of the other countries of the world for the past 50 or 60 years have known the housing conditions of their people. They have had all these facts and from them they have profited greatly. We have got to know what our conditions are, we must get similar information to enable us to legislate for our people as they have done for theirs. Our refusal to do so would be a sign of our lack of interest in this vital subject. [Applause.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this resolution asks for the expenditure of \$8,000,000 to make a national survey of housing. Who asked for this and what is it for?

Is there any demand for it from the rank and file of our constituents at home? I have not had a single request from anyone in my district for it. Indeed, if any of us, after we return to our homes in a few days, should ask the first hundred people we meet on the streets of any of our cities or towns, whether they wanted this survey, not one of them would know what we were talking about.

The demand for this housing survey comes mostly from those people who are interested in creating new political jobs and furthering paternalistic and socialistic legislation.

Particularly the United States Housing Authority would have an interest in this measure. It seems to me, however, after the crushing defeat this bureaucracy suffered at the hands of Congress yesterday, the consideration of this measure before us should be wholly out of order.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not at this point.

Political snoopers are to be sent into every home of the country to find out if it is standard or substandard, in accordance with some preconceived political definition; to find out what electrical equipment, plumbing, and other facilities it may contain. Then after sticking their noses into the home affairs of every family, they are to make a report of their political findings to the housing bureaucracy here in Washington. Here the housing propaganda would then be classified, charted, and statistically arranged into a political sob story to exploit the taxpayers in the name of charity, and believe me, the United States Housing Authority needs a sob story now.

I do not quite agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] when he says next January we will pass these measures more easily, if he includes the United States Housing program. There are some stubborn facts standing in the way for any continuation of that scheme. One, among many others, is that the houses under the program are not being built for real slum dwellers.

Out of 22 tenants renting in the Lake View, Buffalo, N. Y., project, which was 25-percent slum, not one is from the former slum area. In Willert Park, Buffalo, N. Y., of 23 tenants, 2 are from the slum area. One of these has an income of \$600 and the other over \$1,100.

I am sorry the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is not here because I would like to have him hear what I am saying. I take exception to his intimation that the voters back home will press for the passage of these socialistic measures. In my home town, Marion, Ohio, the United States Housing Authority and the Ohio State Housing Board set off certain areas and designated them as slum areas. The people living in them held mass meetings to save their homes. I read you now a telegram I received from some of the people who led the movement to fight off the United States Housing Authority:

Congratulations on your splendid victory. Thanks for your untiring work and understanding in helping defeat this so-called slum clearance. We are happy in our homes tonight. Thank God there are still enough Americans left to keep them safe. We will be on the alert to help nip future threats in the bud. Our neighbors join in sending thanks and best wishes for your continued good health.

Mind you, this telegram is from the people whom the United States Housing Authority program is so solicitous of helping. This telegram gives you an idea as to what they think about it.

Mr. KELLER. Who signed that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This is signed by Lawrence B. Morse and Mary C. Lawrence, of Marion, Ohio.

Mr. KELLER. Slum dwellers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. They live on a street that your U. S. H. A. staked out as a slum area. We have no slums in Marion, Ohio.

Mr. KELLER. If the gentleman—

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Just a moment. I will answer the gentleman's question. Fifty-five percent of the people on

one of these streets in the area marked off as a slum area own their own homes and have them paid for.

It has been stated here there is no good reason for opposing this measure. It carries an appropriation of \$8,000,000 and we do not have 10 cents to pay for it. We will have to mortgage our children in order to get the \$8,000,000. I wonder if that is not a good reason for opposing this measure?

I repeat the primary purpose of this census is to serve as propaganda for the United States Housing Authority to carry out its socialistic program. I am opposing this measure on that ground, as well as on the ground that we do not have the \$8,000,000 to spend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER].

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio just told us that there was no demand for this legislation. I would like to read from the report the names of those organizations that have asked for this legislation. They are as follows: Producers Council, American Institute of Architects, Construction League of America, Associated General Contractors of America, National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Portland Cement Association, National Lime Association, Mason Contractors Association, National Sand and Gravel Association, Structural Clay Products Institute, Metal Window Institute, National Association of Master Plumbers, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association.

These organizations have written the committee, urging that this legislation be enacted. You will notice that these are people who have to do with building material. They are no doubt extremely anxious to know how to plan their business for the future in order that they may employ more people and, naturally, take care of the needs of these people.

Only yesterday I heard a man say that in 2 years from now there will be so many homes in Washington that they will go begging, that they will be a glut upon the market. It would be a splendid thing if we had some way of knowing exactly how many homes are really needed throughout the Nation.

I believe that the request of these building associations and construction companies asking for the pending legislation is an indication, contrary to the statement of my colleague from Ohio, that there is a demand for this type of legislation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEYER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct that this will be valuable information for the building industry of the country and the Government as well in connection with proposing legislation in the future.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS].

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I have the same resentment toward this bill that has my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER]. There is one thing that has not been brought out in this short debate that I think is very important. If this bill passes, and the Federal Government gets all the information and passes it on to the various trades and industries in the country, I ask the question, Of what value can it possibly be? Nobody has any money to buy any of these luxuries. There is no one in this great one-third that the gentleman from Illinois has always been talking about—the ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed—who are going to be able to buy griddle irons and the other improvements that are talked about in this bill. I quite agree with the gentleman from Ohio that this census is going to be made on borrowed money. We are going to have to mortgage our children in

the future to make a survey that, in my opinion, will be absolutely useless after it is made.

The gentleman from Illinois further stated that every civilized nation in the world had this information, but I would like to remind him, and I would like to remind the Committee, that every civilized nation in the world, or practically every one of them, today has a dictator. It is this type of information, this type of centralized bureaucracy that we are building up here, that will lead America down the same road that the other civilized nations of the world have been going.

I have received a few letters and telegrams on this particular bill which would indicate that some of the architects and some of the building trades in the country would like to have it, but, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] stated, I have not had one single letter or telegram from the man on the street—from the fellow who is by far in the majority and who will pay the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat intrigued a few minutes ago by my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] when he told the House some of the things this country did not know about. I just want to take a minute or two to say a few words about some things we do know about. One of these things is that the people of this country need this \$8,000,000 a whole lot worse than they need this census. That is one thing. [Applause.]

Another thing we know about ourselves is that less than 60 years ago only 1 person out of 652 in this Nation received Federal aid, while today 1 out of every 6 looks to Washington for a pay check. That is another thing we know.

We know that we have a national per capita debt of over \$312 or about \$1,560 for the average family of five.

Another thing we know about is that the tax collector now extends his larcenous hand into the pocket of the wage earner and takes 23 cents out of every dollar he earns for taxes, and that the Government is borrowing 39 cents out of every dollar it expends. That is another thing we know.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on almost ad infinitum and tell the things we know. One of the ideas we ought to leave in the minds of the taxpayers before we go home is that we have a little respect for them. We should vote this bill down and save \$8,000,000 before we go home. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this matter came on suddenly, but I wish to express what I believe will be the opinion of the women of this Nation. I believe that women are just going to hate this census, with people coming into their homes and asking them questions; and I will tell you why I think so.

Last year I used a welfare worker from the Government to work on widow's pensions, and the women hated it. They hated the supervision and looking into their cupboards, just as your wives would hate it. But we thought that it was all right since it was the taxpayers' money that was being spent and they were getting something, and it was not bad for them to be penalized that much. In this case, however, as I see it, you have either the businesses—and they do not have any right to make these demands on women—or some remote benefit to the one-third of the Nation, and I question whether for the benefit of one-third of the Nation you have the right to irritate and annoy the rest of the women of this Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the rest of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we have already agreed to spend about \$45,000,000 to take the 1940 census. This is far more money than Congress has ever appropriated in its history for taking the national census. Now you

come along at the last minute in the last hours of the Congress and say that we ought to spend \$8,000,000 more to provide a little more information. The Government has already spent millions of dollars in every State in the Union to provide practically the same information and more with it. That information was brought down to date at the first of this year. It was done mostly with funds allotted to the Works Progress Administration. That information is on file with one of our numerous bureaus. Copies are on file in the Library of Congress right now. There is no demand for this information. According to the records, who asked for it? The heads of one or two of the bureaus here in Washington have said we should have this particular census taken. Somebody, I do not know who, decided that this survey was needed. Those on the committee tell us that the only ones who seem to want this survey are those in connection with either the Housing Administration or the Census Bureau. We can save \$8,000,000 this afternoon for the taxpayers of this country if we really had a desire to do so, but no; you do not want to do that. You are going to spend more money than you ever spent before to take a national census; \$45,000,000 is far more than has been spent before for this purpose; and today you are going to add \$8,000,000 to secure the answers to four or five more questions to secure information that is already on file, for whatever it is worth. One Member says we should have this information so the manufacturers of this country may know where the improvements in the homes are the most lacking. That is not necessary. There are plenty of people who would like to have more modern conveniences. They would have them if they could afford them. You do not need a census like this to find that out, and you know it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to, but I do not have the time.

Mr. KELLER. I am sorry.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am, too, very, very sorry, because I know the gentleman could add some information on this question; however, he has already spoken.

If you really think the information you are talking about this afternoon is necessary, then cut out some of the other questions that will be asked in taking the census. If you have to have this information in addition to all the information you already have, you can get in that way and save \$8,000,000. Under this bill you are adding almost 20 percent to the cost, and, again, nobody seems to care; they just do not even give a rap.

If I thought the \$8,000,000 were going for some good purpose, I would not complain. You have the information in the first place. In the second place, there is plenty of money in the \$45,000,000 already authorized to pay for it. If I have an opportunity today, I am going to offer an amendment to strike out section 3 of this bill. It is the section that authorizes the additional \$8,000,000. You ought to support it by all means. It is not fair to the taxpayers of this country. Oh, I realize only \$8,000,000 is involved, but that is just the trouble. That is just the way we have done things too many times during this session of Congress. You have added \$1,000,000 here and \$5,000,000 there and \$10,000,000 there and \$50,000,000 here and there as you go along. You are going to provide \$8,000,000 to furnish some more jobs to some additional enumerators because it will be necessary to ask four or five additional questions of the people of this country. How in the world you are going to sustain your vote on this bill, I cannot understand. If you want to be just a little bit economy-minded, not very much, during the very last days of this session; if you want to save just a little bit of money for the taxpayers, already overburdened and carrying a bigger load than they can possibly carry, here is your chance to do it. Right here let me suggest that if those who are asking for this information really had the interest of the taxpayers at heart, they would not ask for this \$8,000,000. They could have this information without asking for it. You know that.

This is not a political question and it should not be; it ought to be a question as to whether or not you want to save

the people of this country just a little bit of money, and here is your chance to do it. You already have the information from 48 States in the Union. You have spent Government money over and over again, in every city and every hamlet of this country, to get this very information. Then why in the world spend more to do that thing? It is because, it seems, we have one bureau here that does not coordinate with another bureau over there. It has been brought out here that Secretary Wallace is quoted as saying practically this same information is available. Not only that, go over across the street and you will find nearly all of the same information as is being requested under this measure.

Members of the House, let me say again, if I thought for a minute that there was a demand from the people of this country for this money; if I thought it for the best interests for the rank and file of the folks of this Nation that is overburdened with debt this afternoon, I would not be here opposing this bill. Let us be practical for once during the last hours of this session; let us have enough courage to turn this proposition down. We have too many of our people throughout this great country who are in dire need to spend \$8,000,000 in this way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me complains of the amount of money we have appropriated. Day in and day out we hear the same story from the other side, but they will not give to the country the benefits that accrue to the country not only in one section but in every section.

Only this morning, just by chance, I read the following, and this is a sample of many hundreds of other reports:

Gannett Co.—

Personally, I have seen that name before, signed to scores of letters and telegrams, as you no doubt have. How he can find time to run his business and conduct a mass campaign of propaganda against the administration, I do not know.

Gannett Co. and wholly owned subsidiaries, publishers of newspapers in 14 cities in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, reported for the 6 months ended June 30 net profit, including equity of Gannett Co., in undistributed net profits of controlled companies, of \$645,090.

Mind you, this is only for the 6 months, so in view of the fact that business is improving, very likely the profit in the next 6 months will be much greater.

In all equity, will you not concede that this large profit that has been made by Gannett Co. and by hundreds of other corporations has been made possible only because of legislation enacted by a Democratic administration?

A few days ago I was interviewed by an old publisher who complained of the heavy income tax. I asked him what was his income tax in 1932 and 1933. He said he was not obliged to pay any in those years. I then asked him if he did not have a whole lot more left after paying the income this year than he had in the years of 1932 and 1933, and he was obliged to admit that it was certainly better to pay an income tax than to lose a lot of money as he had done during a Republican administration.

I have questioned other publishers, from time to time, regarding their circulation and profits in 1932 and 1933 as compared with 1936, 1937, and 1938. Hesitating to go into actual figures, they were nevertheless forced to admit that circulation and advertising had increased greatly.

I do know that many publishers were on the verge of bankruptcy in those early years, and now show tremendous profits. In their own interests, therefore, it does seem that they should cease their endless attacks upon an administration that has done so much to aid them.

Of course one reason for the increase in advertising is that many large industrialists prefer to spend ever more than they should for advertising or vote their officials higher salaries rather than to help support the Government through income-tax payments. Then again, advertising liberality

on their part may perhaps have some influence on newspaper editorials, although editors usually deny this. Or so some advertisers hope, when they agree to large-space contracts.

I feel that the money this administration has spent was in a good cause. We have developed our roads, we have built schoolhouses, we have built many institutions and we have built up the greatest Navy in the history of our Nation, so that today our Navy, as was stated by one of the admirals yesterday, is the finest and strongest in the world. We have expended millions for our airplane development. We have expended money, yes; but in a good cause and in the interest of America and in the interest of the American wage earner, so that work can be had, and I feel if it had not been for the reactionary activities on the part of the Republicans, we could have many more hundreds of thousands of people taken off the relief rolls. However, in view of the fact we are going to adjourn today and the Republicans will not be able to harass us or the administration during the next few months, I know that conditions will improve, and I know that when we come back here each and every one of you on that side of the aisle will say, "Well, we did make a mistake, we have erred, we are sorry for it; you have demonstrated that you were right."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to provide information concerning the number, character, and geographical distribution of dwelling structures and dwelling units in the United States and concerning the social and economic characteristics of their ownership and use, necessary to aid in the formulation of a national housing program and in the administration of housing legislation, the Director of the Census shall take a census of housing in each State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska, in the year 1940 in conjunction with the population inquiry of the sixteenth decennial census. Such census of housing shall relate as closely as possible to the day and month provided by law for the population census. The Director of the Census shall be authorized to make such supplementary studies (either in advance of or after the taking of such census) as are necessary to the completion thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "character" and insert "characteristics (including utilities and equipment)."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. If the committee amendment is adopted, will it then be in order to offer an amendment to strike out the words "including utilities and equipment"?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman will have to offer that as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 4, after the word "characteristics" strike out "(including utilities and equipment)".

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER], it was my lot to be born and reared in a modest farm home that had none of the utilities contemplated to be investigated and reported upon under the committee amendment to this bill.

If my amendment is adopted, it will save millions of housewives in this country the embarrassment to which our good friend the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] has called attention, that of having a line of agents at the door inquiring whether or not she has a modern curling iron because the agent had been informed by Washington that the one she did have was not modern, while the one proposed to be sold not only would curl hair but take the gray ones out. This is one of the things that my amendment will prevent.

There is not a single thing contemplated to take a census of under this bill as it is now written that the American people would not buy of their own free will and accord if they had the money to do it without taking a census to discover that they do not possess them. If you pass this bill, the

Government will be compelled to borrow \$3,200,000 of the people's money and add that amount to our bonded indebtedness.

I hope we can adopt this amendment and strike out the needless and endless inquiry that these two words "utilities and equipment" include. This bill means unjustified snooping into every man's home. How far can you go with it? Even the number of water spigots in your homes, whether you have a gas stove or an electric stove, how many light bulbs; have you got a radio, a waffle iron, an electric toaster, an electric bed warmer, and what not, all under the term "utilities and equipment." What is the sense of doing it? I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWKS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is it any of their business?

Mr. DONDERO. Well, I have my own opinion about snooping in the homes of the American people. I, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER], still think a man's home is his castle. Let us not break down that tradition.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope the House will understand one or two things that are apparently misunderstood by my good friend from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. The suggestion was made that if we have a census of the utilities and equipment of the home, that that list will be turned over to the salesman for the radio company or the refrigerator company or the gas cook-stove company—that that list will be turned over and that those companies will be able to learn that at a certain number on a certain street there lives a family that does not have modern bathroom fixtures, and that at a certain number on another street there lives a family that does not own an electrical refrigerator, and that their names and addresses will be turned over to private concerns. If my friend but knew the practice of the Census Bureau and the law of this land, which is not changed by this bill, he would know that that thing has never been done in the history of America and that it cannot be done under the law as it stands today, and that it could not be done if this bill were passed.

Mr. DONDERO. Then why is it that the names of these firms are in here in favor of this bill?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is easy to understand that if a man is engaged in the manufacture of electrical refrigerators, it is worth a great deal to his concern to know that in a certain section of the country there is a wide market for his product, or that my State or the gentleman's State has a certain other average without such equipment, and that a certain section has certain such average. He will then know where the best market is by regions of the Nation, not by individuals. He will know the section of the country in which it would be profitable to engage in that kind of business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Oh, let me finish this question. I think it is plain to understand that it is worth a great deal to the industries of the Nation to have some approximate information as to when they might expect to find a market for a certain line of product, how old the equipment is, how widespread the ownership of that equipment is, that they might know how to arrange their factory plans, that they operate reasonably, and that they may know when to expect to make a profit. Unless they have that information they are working in the dark. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for many years this very Census Bureau has conducted what is known as a census of manufacturers, and the gentleman gets those reports, some times as many as six or eight of them in one mail, and while they do not mean very much to me, they mean a great deal to concerns in these particular lines of business, and this bill as it now stands allows a census of housing and of the equipment of the houses, and that is one of the most important industries in the entire Nation. I refer to the manufacture and the fabrication of dwelling places for our people, and the equipment that goes

therewith, and it is for the purpose of giving to those who are engaged in that business both as artisans and workers and manufacturers the opportunity to know when they might expect to engage in that great business of this Nation that we say we should have this specific information, definite facts and figures, not mere guesses such as we have had from various chambers of commerce.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. In a second. If you emasculate this bill by saying that we are not going to know how many refrigerators or radios the people of this country own, then you deny to a great section of our people the right to know anything about their own business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I wonder if the membership of the House does not realize just like the people in the country do, that every local utility office in the country has all the information with reference to this situation, and every municipally owned utility has all of that information with reference to its locality and that such a proposition as this is just a duplication, and it is perfectly ridiculous for the Government of the United States to be paying out a lot of money to obtain information that is already available. The General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Co., the General Motors all have complete information as to the percentage of different kinds of utility appliances that are owned and operated in all of the houses in every State in the Union, and they are prepared to furnish all that information, and they do furnish it to all of the dealers in the country. Why should we make perfect fools of ourselves and pass legislation that provides for such a foolish thing. I cannot see any reason in the world why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] should not be adopted. There is no excuse for the proposal brought in here by the committee. There is every excuse for voting for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and after that has been adopted, vote down the bill and get rid of this useless, needless, unprofitable, unscientific approach to the problem. No one can go out and take such a census as this and have it accurate without a complete engineering survey of each house. Why, it is perfectly ridiculous to think that ordinary census enumerators can take any survey of that kind that would have the slightest scientific value. The only thing there is to it is the desire of the bureaucrats to expand and to waste the people's money, and we should use our intelligence in approaching the problem rather than being led around by the nose by a group of bureaucrats.

I hope that the committee will adopt the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and I hope that after we get through with the whole performance the house will reject the bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I want to call attention to some of the statements that have been made here that I feel we ought to take into consideration. The first is that this will be a terrible, dreadful, snooping proposition. I do not know whether any of you are old enough to have been present when the census enumerator came around to your house or not. You may all be so young that you have not answered any questions. I am old enough to have answered the questions of the enumerator who came around to my house. I never felt like I was being snooped. I should have felt very bad if I had been neglected and overlooked. The women of my country want very much to get the very best they can out of every 10 years answering some questions, and they do not get fidgety or anxious, and they do not cut up about it, but they welcome all the information they can give. It may be different some place else, but not in southern Illinois nor any place that I know of personally.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Perhaps the ladies in your district welcome things that most women would not welcome.

Mr. KELLER. That is right. Of course they do. [Laughter.] They would not have welcomed me if they did not. [Laughter.] The same might be true of the gentlemen in the lady's district also. But there is no such thing as snooping. That is just dumb nonsense put forward here by a man who does not know or else does not care.

Next, one of the gentlemen said nobody has any money. Let me answer that. Let me call attention to the fact of what enterprise really does. If you had followed the Rural Electrification Administration extension in this country, you would have found this remarkable fact, that since electricity has been put into the homes of the farmers, 90 percent of them have bought radios and get in touch with the world, and listen to the conversations and discussions going on, and become more and more intelligent through that service. The same will be true, to a great extent, as we hear what ought to be done and what can be done about housing.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Do they not become more discontented?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly not, but they do become more intelligent and they do not accept foolish statements from Congressmen or anybody else. When their Congressman gets on the wrong side they kick him as he goes by next time. They have a lot more intelligence than they have been having before, as we all do as our opportunity to get in touch with the world of thought increases.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that he has a very keen appreciation as to just what this bill proposes.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I have.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman take time enough to explain to the House just what his interpretation of the word "characteristics" is?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; certainly. Is it a brick house, a wooden house, a mud house, or a log house? Anybody knows that.

Mr. KEEFE. And will the gentleman also explain what is meant by "equipment"?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; certainly. What kind of a stove have you? What kind of heating have you? A lot of things like that. The gentleman knows that as well as I do. He is just kidding me.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to answer you.

Mr. KELLER. There is one thing I want to call to the attention of the young gentleman who stood up here and pointed out that since the countries of Europe have this information all of them have dictators. Now, I confess the gentleman is young, but he ought to know better than that. I do not know of any country that has a dictator except one that probably has full information on this subject, and the young gentleman ought to know that. I hope he will not get up here and make such a misstatement again because it is nonsense. I just want to point out that there is a real question brought up here by the gentleman making the statement that this is purely a question of whether this is a practical, common-sense thing or not. If we need this information, we ought to vote for the bill. If we all know all about it, as the gentleman from New York insists that we do, although he is the only man I have ever heard who does think so, then we do not need it and we should vote against it. If we do not know it, we ought to vote for the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be concluded in 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes. I have a very important matter of housing to discuss.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I would like some time also.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this question from the very beginning. I have not heard one good reason advanced for the taking of this census. I speak as one who has had some experience as a department store manager. I can say to you that the information you seek by this bill is available to any agency desiring this information for the purpose of selling merchandise to the people of this country. No matter what it is, whether it be refrigerators, electric irons, or anything in connection with household goods, or even in connection with some forms of wearing apparel. This information is available and supplied by the manufacturers of the articles in question. The same thing is true in the matter of housing.

Let me remind you that in our cities pretty generally there is a certain percentage of the population that moves every year. Easily between 25 percent and 33 1/3 percent of our people move from year to year. Even after you have gotten the information concerning a particular family or neighborhood, the family moves out and a new family moves in and the information is of very little value even if you are engaged in a commercial enterprise, and are seeking information regarding that neighborhood.

To spend \$8,000,000 on securing information of this character, you might just as well throw the money out the window, for you would accomplish just as much.

I wish, however, that no partisanship were involved here. I wish that in these matters certain Members would not raise partisan issues. We come here every day with the best of intentions, but in the very beginning of the day before any issue is discussed, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, or some other chairman injects a partisan issue, and immediately we are keyed up to the partisan point of view rather than discussing a proposition in a dispassionate way on its relative merits.

On its merits I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan should prevail. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 75, noes 88.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 93, noes 63.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Statés", strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 7 and 8 down through the word "legislation", in line 9.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, after the word "with", insert "at the same time, and as a part of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "census", strike out the remainder of the line down through the word "census", in line 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "make" and insert in lieu thereof "collect."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "studies" and insert the word "statistics."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. All of the provisions, including penalties, of the act providing for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 13, ch. 4), shall apply to the taking of the census provided for in section 1 of this act.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$8,500,000 to cover the estimated cost of such census.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "\$8,500,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 2, beginning in line 14, strike out all of section 3.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the House this afternoon, in the closing hours of this session, wants to save the taxpayers of this country, if it wants to prevent a further deficit of \$8,000,000 in the Federal Treasury, here is your opportunity to do it. If you are really interested in saving the little sum of \$8,000,000 for the people of this country, which is desired to be used for a proposition that nobody has asked for, which nobody has demanded except a bureau down here in Washington, then vote for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the information required by this bill is already available if the bureau care to seek it out. We have already spent millions of dollars of relief money for the purpose of attempting to secure information of this sort. We have already agreed to spend \$45,000,000 to take a census in 1940, millions of dollars more than we have appropriated heretofore for this kind of information. You can get the information if you want it with the \$45,000,000, if you really want to do so. If you want to go ahead and employ a few more job seekers, hire a few more and put them on the Federal pay roll and pay them this \$8,000,000 to secure the information which is not required, then go ahead and spend \$8,000,000 more this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, it was suggested or inferred this afternoon that I was not in favor of any appropriations by the Federal Government. This is not correct. I have at all times supported appropriations that, in my judgment, were for the good and in the interest of the farmers and laborers of this country. I have supported relief appropriations time after time. I have opposed the extravagant use of taxpayers money of this great Nation of ours. I have opposed measures that to my mind were unnecessary and wasteful. Let me repeat that we forget that after all these expenditures are met and paid for by the laborer, the farmer, and the home owner, as well as the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, the House should support my amendment. You have this information; if you want to get it again you have more money than you have ever had authorized before for that purpose. Why spend \$8,000,000 more that you will

have to borrow and then charge to an already over-tax-burdened people. Forget politics. Let us strike out the \$8,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the House should agree to my amendment if the Members want to be fair to their constituents, if they want to be fair to the taxpayers who are already bankrupt. I ask the Members to vote for my amendment in the last hours of the present session.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, it permits a census to be taken, but it will require the question of the amount of money needed or whether even additional funds would be required to go through the usual proceeding of having a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the provision as amended by the committee require the matter to go before the Appropriations Committee? This bill contains an authorization. There would not be any appropriation without going to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I believe the question of the amount of money should be left to the Appropriations Committee. As I understand the bill, the Senate bill provided for the appropriation.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOSER. The position taken by the gentleman from Virginia is exactly the position I took in the committee at the time of the hearing. I mentioned specifically, in the absence of testimony to justify an authorization of \$8,000,000 or \$8,500,000, that after the census was taken, if it was taken, under any deficiency bill the gentleman from Virginia or any other member of the Appropriations Committee could take care of it in the next session of Congress, because the money will not be expended until some time during the year 1940.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. There must be some authorization or the Committee on Appropriations could not bring in a bill. This bill authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed \$8,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations can have a hearing next winter and bring in a provision for whatever it believes is necessary. Like the gentleman, I thought that this was an appropriation until I looked at this bill again and found that it is not. I do not see any reason why the gentleman cannot accede to this authorization, and then he can later have a hearing and determine how much money is needed.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will be frank to say that after reading the provision again it does appear that it is just an authorization.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Under the general law creating the Bureau of the Census, would the Committee on Appropriations have authority to provide the necessary appropriation for this work without this section in the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I doubt if we would for this particular sort of census. I came into the room just as the amendment was being read. Perhaps I did not exactly catch the force of it. As far as I am concerned, I have felt all the time that this census could be taken as a part of the regular census without the necessity of spending a lot of money in addition.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say to the gentleman that I also believe it probably could be done as a part of the regular census. When it was provided

that this census would be taken with the other census, after conferring with gentlemen on the other side I said I would call Mr. Austin and if he said he could get along with no additional money or a smaller amount I would come back and so report to the House.

Mr. Austin said that this is an entirely new survey, that every dollar the Congress appropriated to take the general census has been budgeted, and that he does not have one dollar to do this work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I was particularly interested to see that some question of the amount of money would be passed upon by the committee and the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. That still will be before the Committee on Appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I just now sent over to the Library to get information which I knew it had regarding both urban and rural housing in America. I have here a large volume entitled "Financial Survey of Urban Housing, a Civil Works Administration Project." This volume contains a survey and all the information sought to be secured by this measure, in every city and village in the country, cataloged by cities and cataloged by the sort of information you want. In fact, we not only have this data available for the urban centers, but the rural areas as well. In connection with the National Emergency Council, in a report issued in March 1939, there is available through the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Engineering, a survey of rural housing. Reports are available on rural community buildings, farm buildings in the Northeastern, Western, and Southern States, farm-house plans, modernization of existing farm homes, roof coverings, sewage disposal, water supply, plumbing, heating, and other phases of rural farm life.

The Bureau of Home Economics has conducted research in the use of wood in building and construction work. Under the Department of Commerce the National Bureau of Standards tests building materials and structures. Under the Department of Labor the Bureau of Labor Statistics collects and publishes data relative to housing construction and other types of construction in the United States. The Public Health Service in the Treasury Department conducts research in connection with the determination of the basic principles of healthful housing. There are other departments here which have made similar studies. If I had the time I could give you information regarding a most illuminating survey that has been made through the Civil Works Administration and various other agencies of the Government containing all the data and all the information it is desired to secure through this project.

Why in the world is it necessary to ask for a \$8,000,000 appropriation now, when we have spent millions of dollars through the Civil Works Administration as recently as 1934? All the information now desired is available. Through the regular agencies of the Government we have all this data available. I say to you that if ever there was an expenditure that is out of line with what is desired today and the conditions we are facing today, this bill is certainly out of line. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas should be supported. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and, on a division, demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas, there were—ayes 72, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAVAGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2240) to provide for a national census of housing, pursuant to House Resolution 281, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 145, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—192

Allen, La.	Dunn	Kocialkowski	Rayburn
Allen, Pa.	Eberhart	Kramer	Richards
Anderson, Mo.	Ellis	Larrabee	Risk
Arnold	Evans	Lea	Robertson
Barden	Faddis	Leavy	Robinson, Utah
Barry	Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Beckworth	Ferguson	Ludlow	Romjue
Bell	Flaherty	McAndrews	Ryan
Bland	Flannagan	McArdle	Sabath
Bloom	Ford, Leland M.	McCormack	Sacks
Boland	Ford, Miss.	McGehee	Sandager
Boykin	Garrett	McKeough	Sasser
Bradley, Pa.	Gathings	McLaughlin	Satterfield
Brooks	Gavagan	McMillan, John L.	Schuetz
Brown, Ga.	Geyer, Calif.	Maclejewski	Schulte
Buck	Gibbs	Mahon	Schwert
Buckler, Minn.	Gore	Maloney	Scrugham
Burch	Gossett	Marcantonio	Shanley
Burdick	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Colo.	Shannon
Burgin	Griffith	Martin, Ill.	Sheppard
Byrne, N. Y.	Hare	Merritt	Sirovich
Byrns, Tenn.	Hart	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Conn.
Cannon, Fla.	Harter, Ohio	Mills, La.	Smith, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Havener	Monroney	Smith, Va.
Cartwright	Healey	Mouton	Smith, W. Va.
Casey, Mass.	Hendricks	Murdock, Ariz.	Snyder
Celler	Hill	Murdock, Utah	Somers, N. Y.
Chandler	Hinshaw	Myers	South
Claypool	Hobbs	Nelson	Sparkman
Cochran	Houston	Nichols	Starnes, Ala.
Coffee, Wash.	Hunter	Norrell	Steagall
Cole, Md.	Izac	Norton	Sutphin
Colmer	Jacobsen	O'Connor	Tarver
Connery	Jarman	O'Day	Tenerowicz
Cooper	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Leary	Terry
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Toole	Thomas, Tex.
Cox	Johnson, W. Va.	Pace	Thomason
Crosser	Jones, Tex.	Parsons	Tolan
Cullen	Kee	Patrick	Vinson, Ga.
D'Alessandro	Keller	Patton	Voorhis, Calif.
Darden	Kelly	Peterson, Fla.	Wallgren
Delaney	Kennedy, Md.	Peterson, Ga.	Walter
Dempsey	Kennedy, Michael	Pfeifer	Ward
DeRouen	Keogh	Pierce, Oreg.	Warren
Dickstein	Kerr	Poage	Whelchel
Doxey	Kilday	Polk	Whittington
Drewry	Kirwan	Ramspeck	Williams, Mo.
Duncan	Kitchens	Randolph	Wood

NAYS—145

Alexander	Case, S. Dak.	Fulmer	Heinke
Andersen, H. Carl	Chiperfield	Gamble	Hess
Anderson, Calif.	Church	Gartner	Hoffman
Andersen, A. H.	Clason	Gearhart	Hope
Andrews	Clevenger	Gehrmann	Horton
Angell	Cole, N. Y.	Gerlach	Hull
Arends	Crawford	Gifford	Jarrett
Ashbrook	Culkin	Gilchrist	Jenkins, Ohio
Austin	Curtis	Gillie	Jenks, N. H.
Ball	Darrow	Graham	Jensen
Bates, Mass.	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.	Johns
Bender	Disney	Gross	Johnson, Ill.
Blackney	Ditter	Guyer, Kans.	Jones, Ohio
Boehne	Dondero	Gwynne	Kean
Bolles	Dowell	Hall	Keefe
Bolton	Durham	Halleck	Kinzer
Bradley, Mich.	Dworshak	Hancock	Lambertson
Brown, Ohio	Edmiston	Harness	Landis
Bryson	Elston	Harter, N. Y.	LeCompte
Carlson	Engel	Hartley	Lemke
Carter	Fenton	Hawks	Lewis, Ohio

Luce	Murray	Schafer, Wis.
McDowell	O'Brien	Schiffer
McLean	Oliver	Secombe
McLeod	Osmers	Seger
Maas	Pearson	Shafer, Mich.
Mapes	Pierce, N. Y.	Simpson
Marshall	Pittenger	Smith, Maine
Martin, Iowa	Plumley	Smith, Ohio
Martin, Mass.	Reed, Ill.	Springer
Mason	Rees, Kans.	Sumner, Ill.
Michener	Rich	Taber
Miller	Rockefeller	Talle
Monkiewicz	Rodgers, Pa.	Taylor, Tenn.
Moser	Rogers, Mass.	Thorkelson
Mott	Routzohn	Tibbott
Mundt	Rutherford	Tinkham

NOT VOTING—91

Allen, Ill.	Curley	Johnson, Ind.	Schaefer, Ill.
Barnes	Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Secrest
Barton	Dingell	Kennedy, Martin	Short
Bates, Ky.	Doughton	Kleberg	Smith, Wash.
Beam	Douglas	Knutson	Spence
Boren	Eaton, Calif.	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Brewster	Eaton, N. J.	Lanham	Stefan
Buckley, N. Y.	Elliott	Lesinski	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Englebright	McGranery	Summers, Tex.
Byron	Fernandez	McMillan, Thos. S.	Sweeney
Caldwell	Fish	Magnuson	Taylor, Colo.
Chapman	Fitzpatrick	Mansfield	Thill
Clark	Flannery	Massingale	Thomas, N. J.
Cluett	Folger	May	Vincent, Ky.
Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Thomas F.	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Collins	Fries	O'Neal	Weaver
Cooley	Green	Patman	Welch
Corbett	Gregory	Powers	White, Idaho
Courtney	Harrington	Rabaut	Wolfenden, Pa.
Creal	Hennings	Rankin	Woodruff, Mich.
Crowe	Holmes	Reece, Tenn.	Woodrum, Va.
Crowther	Hook	Reed, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Cummings	Jeffries	Robison, Ky.	

So the bill passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Byron (for) with Mr. Allen of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky (for) with Mr. Robison of Kentucky (against).
 Mr. Hook (for) with Mr. Cluett (against).
 Mr. Lesinski (for) with Mr. Thill (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan (against).
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois (for) with Mr. Powers (against).
 Mr. McGranery (for) with Mr. Fish (against).
 Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
 Mr. Buckley of New York (for) with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey (against).
 Mr. Caldwell (for) with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire (against).
 Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Reece of Tennessee (against).
 Mr. Hennings (for) with Mr. Knutson (against).
 Mr. Weaver (for) with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Curley (for) with Mr. Douglas (against).
 Mr. Mitchell (for) with Mr. Jeffries (against).
 Mr. Flannery (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
 Mr. May with Mr. Brewster.
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Stefan.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey (against).
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Barton.
 Mr. Thomas S. McMillan with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kunkel.
 Mr. Doughton with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Eaton of California.
 Mr. Crowe with Mr. Coffee of Nebraska.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. O'Neal.
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Zimmerman.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Elliott.
 Mr. Barnes with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. Creal with Mr. Fernandez.
 Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Fries.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Folger.
 Mr. Secrest with Mr. Dies.
 Mr. Massingale with Mr. Anderson of Missouri.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Boren.
 Mr. Spence with Mr. Green.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Balridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 139. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code relating to method of computing annuities.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5681. An act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1989. An act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an International Exhibition of Polar Exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940; and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2001) entitled "An act for the equalization of letter carriers," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. FRAZIER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4117) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders; and

S. 2697. An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present three unanimous-consent requests, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asks unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the bill H. R. 7462, the third deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asks unanimous consent that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 7462, the third deficiency appropriation bill, and agree to the conference which may be asked by the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint conferees on said bill, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will report the next unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asks unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII, it shall be in order on tomorrow to consider a conference report upon the bill H. R. 7462.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do this in order that the Members may understand what the program is. It is probable that the Senate will pass this bill sometime about 8:30 o'clock tonight, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And it will be impossible to get the amendments of the Senate to the House in such shape that the House conferees could consider them before morning?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. And it is the purpose, as soon as possible in the morning, to have the conferees get together and try to come to an agreement in a conference report and bring it in to be disposed of.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I see no reason why we should not have a conference report for consideration very shortly after convening tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. After 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Shortly after 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Virginia if the House expects to accede to the Senate amendment placing the Commodity Credit Corporation item in the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is asking the gentleman from Virginia what the House expects to do. That is a pretty big order.

Mr. PARSONS. I am asking what the House conferees plan to do about that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The House conferees plan to go into it carefully and thoroughly and, if possible, to maintain the position of the House.

Mr. PARSONS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, I shall be constrained to object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman understand what the request is? I suggest that the request be repeated so that the gentleman from Illinois may understand.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the conferees will bring that subject matter back to the House for a vote upon it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman knows that we have already unanimous consent that the bill shall go to conference. That request has been granted. The request now is merely to permit the conference report to be brought in tomorrow instead of Monday. Is the gentleman intending to object to that?

Mr. PARSONS. I am asking the gentleman a very pertinent question as to whether or not the conferees will bring that item here for the House to vote upon.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot promise the gentleman to bring that in as a separate item for the House to vote upon, but the gentleman knows the position I took on it, and I shall try to maintain that position as best I can, bearing in mind the fact the bill has to be passed and that Congress should adjourn.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The purpose is simply to adjourn tomorrow night instead of Monday night.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN. And that is the purpose of the last request?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCHRAN. The other two requests have already been granted?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. In the event the Clerk receives the message tonight, under the unanimous consent agreement, the Chair appoints the following conferees upon the part of the House:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. THOMAS S. McMILLAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have until the printing of the final CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include memorial addresses on those Members who have passed away during the session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman's request is limited to memorial addresses. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert some eulogistic remarks with reference to the late Douglas H. Johnston and also Will Rogers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIG. GEN. HARLEY B. FERGUSON

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 159), authorizing the appointment of Harley B. Ferguson as a major general, United States Army.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think it will do any good. We have plenty of other applications ahead.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

MATILDA LARNED BOUCK

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6808), for the relief of Matilda Larned Bouck, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK D. COLLINS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6259) for the relief of Jack D. Collins, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after "act", insert "Provided further, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 90 days from the approval of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARNET WARREN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2271) for the relief of Barnet Warren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the statement.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2271) entitled "An act for the relief of Barnet Warren," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

H. H. SCHWARTZ,
P. M. BROWN,
J. G. TOWNSEND,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2271), for the relief of Barnet Warren, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

This bill, as it passed the Senate, provided for the payment of the sum of \$2,459.34 to the claimant, and the additional sum of \$100 per month in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States growing out of any damages or personal injuries suffered by him when a Civilian Conservation Corps truck operated at the time by the National Park Service, collided with the claimant, who was riding a bicycle north on United States Highway No. 1 near Ojus, Fla., on March 17, 1939.

The lump-sum payment of \$2,459.34 represents the amount of expenses involved, and the monthly payments are for his permanent injury and pain and suffering.

The Committee on Claims recommended passage of the bill as it passed the Senate, but an amendment was made on the floor of the House reducing the limit of monthly payments to a total not to exceed \$2,500 instead of \$5,000. The records in the case clearly justify the bill as it passed the Senate and as it was recommended by the Committee on Claims in the House, and the conferees have so agreed.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1708), amending the Employers' Liability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the Bill (S. 1708) to amend the Employer's Liability Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House, insert the following:

"That sections 1 and 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases', approved April 22, 1908 (35 Stat. 65; U. S. C., title 45, secs. 51 and 54), be, and they are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That every common carrier by railroad while engaging in commerce between any of the several States or Territories, or between any of the States and Territories, or between the District

of Columbia and any of the States or Territories, or between the District of Columbia or any of the States or Territories and any foreign nation or nations, shall be liable in damages to any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier in such commerce, or, in case of the death of such employee, to his or her personal representative, for the benefit of the surviving widow or husband and children of such employee; and, if none, then of such employee's parents; and, if none, then of the next of kin dependent upon such employee, for such injury or death resulting in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence, in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, works, boats, wharves, or other equipment."

"Any employee of a carrier, any part of whose duties as such employee shall be the furtherance of interstate or foreign commerce; or shall, in any way directly or closely and substantially, affect such commerce as above set forth shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered as being employed by such carrier in such commerce and shall be considered as entitled to the benefits of this Act and of an Act entitled 'An Act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases' (approved April 22, 1908), as the same has been or may hereafter be amended."

"SEC. 4. That in any action brought against any common carrier under or by virtue of any of the provisions of this Act to recover damages for injuries to, or the death of, any of its employees, such employee shall not be held to have assumed the risks of his employment in any case where such injury or death resulted in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier; and no employee shall be held to have assumed the risks of his employment in any case where the violation by such common carrier of any statute enacted for the safety of employees contributed to the injury or death of such employee."

"SEC. 2. That the first sentence of section 6, of the Act entitled 'An Act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases', approved April 22, 1908 (35 Stat. 65; U. S. C. title 45, sec. 56), be, and it is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That no action shall be maintained under this Act unless commenced within three years from the day the cause of action accrued."

"SEC. 3. That the Act entitled 'An Act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases', approved April 22, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., title 45, ch. 2), be, and it is hereby, amended by adding an additional section thereto as follows:

"SEC. 10. Any contract, rule, regulation, or device whatsoever, the purpose, intent, or effect of which shall be to prevent employees of any common carrier from furnishing voluntarily information to a person in interest as to the facts incident to the injury or death of any employee, shall be void, and whoever, by threat, intimidation, order, rule, contract, regulation, or device whatsoever, shall attempt to prevent any person from furnishing voluntarily such information to a person in interest, or whoever discharges or otherwise disciplines or attempts to discipline any employee for furnishing voluntarily such information to a person in interest, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for each offense: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to void any contract, rule, or regulation with respect to any information contained in the files of the carrier, or other privileged or confidential reports."

"If any provision of this Act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
ARTHUR D. HEALEY,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
EARL C. MICHENER,
U. S. GUYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

M. M. NEELY,
EDWARD R. BURKE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2185) to amend the Employers' Liability Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill provided that in actions brought under the Employers' Liability Act employees shall not be held to have assumed the risks of their employment where injury or death results in whole or in part from the negligence of the carrier. The House amendment limited this provision to cases where the employee had not had actual notice of a negligently maintained condition or practice. The conferees agreed to the provisions of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill contained a provision that no action shall be maintained under the act unless commenced within 2 years from the day the cause of action accrued. The House amendment contained no provision with reference to limitation of time within which suit may be brought. The conferees agreed to a limitation of 3 years.

The Senate bill also contained a provision which made illegal and void any efforts to prevent railroad-company employees from furnishing voluntarily information to a person in interest with reference to the facts incident to the injury or death of any railroad employee. It made it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, to attempt to coerce an employee to prevent him from furnishing such information or to discipline or discharge him for so doing.

While the House amendment did not contain this provision, the House last Congress passed a bill containing such provision, and this session the Judiciary Committee reported to the House a bill, H. R. 4989, containing the same provision with the following proviso: "Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to void any contract, rule, or regulation with respect to any information contained in the files of the carrier, or other privileged or confidential reports."

The conferees agreed to this provision with the proviso above quoted.

The conferees agreed to a Senate provision, not contained in the House amendment, which is intended to broaden the scope of the Employers' Liability Act so as to include within its provisions employees of common carriers who, while ordinarily engaged in the transportation of interstate commerce, may be, at the time of injury, temporarily divorced therefrom and engaged in intrastate operations.

The question whether an employee, at the time of his injury, is engaged in interstate or intrastate commerce is frequently difficult of determination. Under the rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States, an employee of a railroad company who may be injured must be found to have been engaged, at the time of the infliction of the injury, "in transportation or work so closely related to it as to be practically a part of it" (*Shanks v. D., L. & W. R. R.*).

EMANUEL CELLER,
ARTHUR D. HEALEY,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
U. S. GUYER,
EARL C. MICHENER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2185) to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. The House substitute includes among others an additional district judgeship for New Jersey?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think there will be any objection if it is the purpose of the committee to offer an amendment to strike out the New Jersey judgeship.

Mr. WALTER. It is the purpose of the committee to permit the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] to offer an amendment which will strike from the bill the New Jersey provision.

Mr. MICHENER. So that everybody will understand, may I say, that if passed this will go to conference, and there is nothing to prevent the conferees from putting New Jersey back in the bill. A vacancy exists amongst the New Jersey judges at the present time and has existed for 13 or 14 months. It has not been filled, yet here we are asked to authorize another judge. As I understand the situation, the trouble is that the Department of Justice cannot find the "right" man, and the difficulty in finding the "right" man is that Senator SMATHERS wants one man, whom he considers the right man, appointed, while Mr. Hague, the political boss, has another man whom he considers the right man. The effect of this provision in the bill is to give them each a judge—two new judges to be appointed. If the President has not filled this vacancy for 14 months, the House certainly is not justified in authorizing another judgeship just to iron out a political squabble.

Unless we can have some assurance that the conferees will insist on keeping the additional New Jersey judgeship out of the bill there certainly will be objection on this side.

I voted to report this bill out because it had the recommendation of the judicial conference. It was shown that they needed an additional judge up there. I did not know that they have had an unfilled vacancy for more than a year. If the Attorney General cannot find the "right" man to fill one vacancy, why make his task more difficult by asking him to find two new judges.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan has stated is the fact. I do know that the Judicial Conference and the Attorney General of the United States recommended an additional judge, and that every judge in the State of New Jersey recommended this additional judgeship. In addition to that there was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary recommendations from bar associations together with complaints of the condition of the docket.

Mr. MICHENER. That is true, and for that reason I voted to report the bill out but I did not know at that time that they wanted this additional judge just so Senator SMATHERS could name a judge and Hague could name one, too. If they have been 14 months without this judge, and the new appointee cannot be confirmed until Congress convenes next January, I do not see the haste in authorizing another judge now. The Judicial Conference will meet in Washington in September and at that time if another judge is needed the Conference will report it, and the Committee on the Judiciary, without any doubt, will unanimously report the bill the Judicial Conference recommends, provided, of course, the present vacancy has been filled. Surely the wheels of justice turn slowly when it comes to selecting judges by the Department of Justice and the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered to the Young Democrats of Virginia by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FISHERIES PRODUCTS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5681), to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "shellfish", insert "mollusks and."

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "and similar forms of aquatic life and byproducts thereof)."

Page 2, line 3, after "funds", insert "not to exceed \$1,500,000 per year."

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) From the fund authorized to be transferred by section 1 hereof, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce sums as follows to be maintained in a separate fund: \$75,000, which shall be used by the Secretary of Commerce to promote the free flow of the domestically produced fishery products in commerce by conducting a fishery educational service; and \$100,000, which shall be used by the Secretary of Commerce to develop and increase markets for fisheries products of domestic origin."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 1, line 3, insert after the word "funds" the following: "not to exceed \$1,500,000 per year", and strike out the same words on page 2, line 3.

Strike out the words "Secretary of Commerce" where they appear in section 2 and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior."

The amendments to the Senate amendments were agreed to.

The Senate amendments as amended were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN MARY LOCKE

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1815) for the relief of Evelyn Mary Locke.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of deportation heretofore issued against Evelyn Mary Locke. Hereafter such alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on October 12, 1937, at the port of Blaine, Wash.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EMPLOY ENGINEERS, ETC.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 6379, to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I may say this is the bill to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] objected, but he has agreed to two amendments which I have sent to the desk and the bill will be amended in that particular.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 15 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, and economists, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him, but not to exceed \$50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, or economist so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, or economist during any fiscal year shall not exceed \$9,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 1, line 10, strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNATURE TO ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a House concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 35

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be and they are hereby authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS IN THE GREAT PLAINS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1802) authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the amendments which I have shown to the gentleman, and which I intend to offer, are satisfactory to him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to undertake the construction, including acquisition of water rights, rights-of-way, and other interests in land, of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

Sec. 2. Any moneys expended on such construction from appropriations made under the authority of this act shall be repaid to the United States by the water users in not to exceed 40 annual installments. Any labor or materials supplied for such construction by the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, or any other Federal agency shall be utilized in such manner as the President may determine, and for such labor and materials the water users shall reimburse the United States in such amounts and on such terms as the President may fix for each project.

Sec. 3. No moneys may be expended on a project pursuant to the authority of this act unless and until (1) the Secretary of the Interior has found, and has certified to the President, that the project has engineering feasibility and that the moneys to be expended on the project from appropriations made under the authority of this act probably can be repaid by the water users within 40 years; and (2) the President has approved said findings and has determined that labor and materials for the construction of the project should be made available to the Department of the Interior by the Work Projects Administration or a similar Federal agency, in the amount found by the Secretary of the Interior to make up the difference, if any, between the estimated cost of construction and the amount which can be expended from appropriations made under this act and probably can be repaid by the water users: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may accept for the construction of the project such labor or materials as may be offered by any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, or municipal corporation, and may reduce by the amount thereof the estimated cost of construction to be met by the expenditure of Federal moneys.

Sec. 4. In undertaking any project pursuant to the authority of this act the Secretary of the Interior, by cooperative agreements with the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agencies or State agencies, may arrange for such cooperation of governmental agencies in the construction or operation and maintenance of the project as he deems desirable.

Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including investigations and surveys of projects proposed under the authority of this act, any sums appropriated to be subject to transfer by the Secretary of the Interior, in such amounts as he deems necessary to executive departments or other Federal agencies pursuant to cooperative agreements entered into under section 4 of this act; and, from such sums appropriated or transferred, expenditures may be made for personal services in the District of

Columbia and may be made for the same purposes and under the same conditions as included in the appropriation acts for the departments, establishments, and other agencies to which sums may be made available by appropriation or transfer.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to undertake the construction, including acquisition of water rights, rights-of-way, and other interests in land, of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

"Sec. 2. Any moneys expended on such construction from appropriations made under the authority of this act shall be repaid to the United States by the water users in not to exceed 40 annual installments. Any labor or materials supplied for such construction by the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, or any other Federal agency shall be utilized in such manner as the President may determine, and for such labor and materials the water users shall reimburse the United States in such amounts and on such terms as the President may fix for each project.

"Sec. 3. No moneys may be expended on a project pursuant to the authority of this act unless and until (1) the Secretary of the Interior has found, and has certified to the President, that the project has engineering feasibility and that the moneys to be expended on the project from appropriations made under the authority of this act probably can be repaid by the water users within 40 years; and (2) the President has approved said findings and has determined that labor and materials for the construction of the project should be made available to the Department of the Interior by the Work Projects Administration or a similar Federal agency, in the amount found by the Secretary of the Interior to make up the difference, if any, between the estimated cost of construction and the amount which can be expended from appropriations made under this act and probably can be repaid by the water users: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may accept for the construction of the project such labor or materials as may be offered by any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, or municipal corporation, and may reduce by the amount thereof the estimated cost of construction to be met by the expenditure of Federal moneys.

"Sec. 4. In undertaking any project pursuant to the authority of this act the Secretary of the Interior, by cooperative agreements with the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agencies or State agencies, may arrange for such cooperation of governmental agencies in the construction or operation and maintenance of the project as he deems desirable.

"Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including investigations and surveys of projects proposed under the authority of this act, any sums appropriated to be subject to transfer by the Secretary of the Interior, in such amounts as he deems necessary to executive departments or other Federal agencies pursuant to cooperative agreements entered into under section 4 of this act; and, from such sums appropriated or transferred, expenditures may be made for personal services in the District of Columbia and may be made for the same purposes and under the same conditions as included in the appropriation acts for the departments, establishments, and other agencies to which sums may be made available by appropriation or transfer."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Strike out all of section 4 and in section 5 strike out the following words: "Any sums appropriated to be subject to transfer by the Secretary of the Interior in such amounts as he deems necessary to executive departments or other Federal agencies pursuant to cooperative agreements entered into under section 4 of this act."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN HELPLESS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6898, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of veterans of the Civil War, with Senate amendments thereto, and to agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of John Dudley, helpless and dependent child of Seth B. Dudley, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Velma G. Rose, helpless and dependent child of Daniel D. Rose, late of the United States Signal Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Minnie O. Draper, helpless and dependent child of Alvin L. Draper, late of Troop B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Mary E. Farrar, helpless and dependent child of Thomas J. Farrar, late of Company C, First Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Veterans' Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Roy Joyce, helpless and dependent child of Minos Joyce, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Alma Blanche Shipman, helpless and dependent child of Wesley C. Shipman, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Clarence Edward Shipman, helpless and dependent child of Wesley C. Shipman, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of William Edward Fugatt, helpless and dependent child of Edward Fugatt, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Katie Glenn, helpless and dependent child of Thomas Glenn, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Edward Morgan, helpless and dependent child of Sylvester Robinson, known as Charles Morgan, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Sam H. Hadley, helpless and dependent child of Edwin Hadley, late of Company C, South Cumberland Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Fieldon Adkins, helpless and dependent child of James P. Adkins, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Ann M. Callery, helpless and dependent child of Phillip Callery, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Gertrude Claypool, helpless and dependent child of Augustus Lewis Claypool, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Nora A. Kitchen, helpless and dependent child of William N. Kitchen, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Blanche Walker, helpless and dependent child of William C. Walker, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Excella Lague-Leyo, helpless and dependent child of Joseph Leyo, alias Joseph LeJane, late of Company E, Second Regiment New Hampshire Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Delta Teachout, helpless and dependent child of Royal B. Teachout, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of William H. Kelly, helpless and dependent child of William Kelly, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Oscar Hinson, helpless and dependent child of Allen Hinson, late of Company B, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Margaret A. Silva, helpless and dependent child of Joseph Silva, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Hattie E. Lamb, helpless and dependent child of John W. Lamb, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Nora J. Buchanan, helpless and dependent child of Charles H. Buchanan, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Viola L. Buchanan, helpless and dependent child of Charles H. Buchanan, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

Page 26, after line 6, insert:

"The name of Amanda M. Evert, helpless and dependent child of Frederick Evert, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. HARNES asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

MARY COHEN BIENVENU

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) readmitting Mary Cohen Bienvenu to citizenship.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 72

Resolved, etc., That Mary Cohen Bienvenu, a native citizen of the United States, born in Atlanta, Ga., the daughter of John Sanford Cohen, a former Senator of the United States from the State of Georgia, who is alleged to have forfeited her citizenship by marriage with an alien in 1934, be, and she is hereby, on her own application unconditionally readmitted to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States of America.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas, Miss SUMNER of Illinois, Mr. KINZER, and Mr. DIRKSEN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona, and Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain articles and editorials regarding the Philippine situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Bergen Evening Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Atlanta Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill (S. 2240) to provide for a national census of housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the distinguished public career of the late Hon. William F. Kopp, who represented the district I now represent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Oregon Daily Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend in the RECORD the remarks I made today and include therein a few brief extracts from several letters and publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some resolutions passed by the Washington State Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein several editorials and financial reports from the newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. CHURCH reserved the right to object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Financial reports on what subject?

Mr. SABATH. On the financial situation and increasing business profits in the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. To that I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHURCH. I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Was the gentleman afraid about the report?

Mr. CHURCH. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Tampa Tribune on the industries of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the International Cigar Makers Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to discuss the situation which confronts agriculture as a result of the misapplication and misinterpretation of the terms of the Fair Labor Standards Act, generally referred to as the wage-hour law, by the present Administrator. It is pathetic and yet true that so many misstatements have been made and so much misleading propaganda has been disseminated in an attempt to mislead the American public as to the purpose and contents of H. R. 7133. In fact, this propaganda has reached the point that Administrator Elmer F. Andrews and the chairman of the Labor Committee have resorted to name calling and insinuations through various press releases, radio speeches, and committee hearings. In my opinion, neither of them will be very proud of this after the smoke of battle clears away. This procedure has not greatly disturbed those interested in the measure, for it is a fairly well recognized fact that name calling and unpleasant insinuations are usually resorted to where logic and good sound reasoning are not available to support one's stand.

There is no disposition on my part to call anyone names or to question their motives or sincerity. I like to accord everyone the right to stand up for their conscientious convictions, whether I agree with them or not. To do otherwise would be to embrace that despicable monster called intolerance. So without discussing this angle further, I would like to rest my contentions and arguments upon bare, cold, undeniable facts, which, in my opinion, are far more powerful and acceptable to the American people than name calling—a recent exhibition of this has certainly not proven any too acceptable to the American people.

When the wage-hour law was passed by Congress, it was generally understood that agriculture and agricultural operations were exempted from the operation of the law, and especially those operations which have a direct bearing upon the prices received by the farmers for their products. In order to clearly present this picture, I desire at this point to quote from Public, No. 718, Seventy-fifth Congress, generally referred to as the Wage-Hour Act. I quote from section 3, paragraph F, which is as follows:

Agriculture includes farming in all its branches, and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market.

I also desire to quote from the maximum-hour provision, section 7 of the existing law, as follows:

No employer shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce—

(1) for a workweek longer than 44 hours during the first year from the effective date of this section;

(2) for a workweek longer than 42 hours during the second year from such date; or

(3) for a workweek longer than 40 hours after the expiration of the second year from such date, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified

at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

No employer shall be deemed to have violated subsection (a) by employing any employee for a workweek in excess of that specified in such subsection without paying the compensation for overtime employment prescribed therein if such employee is so employed for a period or periods of not more than 14 workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year in an industry found by the Administrator to be of a seasonal nature. In the case of an employer engaged in the first processing of milk, whey, skimmed milk, or cream into dairy products, or in the ginning and compressing of cotton, or in the processing of cottonseed, or in the processing of sugar beets, sugar-beet molasses, sugarcane, or maple sap into sugar, but not refined sugar, or into sirup, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to his employees in any place of employment where he is so engaged; and in the case of an employer engaged in the first processing of, or in canning or packing, perishable or seasonal fresh fruits or vegetables, or in the first processing, within the area of production (as defined by the Administrator), of any agricultural or horticultural commodity during seasonal operations, or in handling, slaughtering, or dressing poultry or livestock, the provisions of subsection (a), during a period or periods of not more than 14 workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year, shall not apply to his employees in any place of employment where he is so engaged.

It can be clearly seen from the above that the only confusing term used is "within the area of production (as defined by the Administrator)." I also desire to quote from section 13 (a) of the existing law.

The provisions of sections 6 and 7 (which relate to wages and hours respectively) shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, professional, or local retailing capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee engaged in any retail or service establishment the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce; or (3) any employee employed as a seaman; or (4) any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title II of the Railway Labor Act; or (5) any employee employed in the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, including the going to and returning from work and including employment in the loading, unloading, or packing of such products for shipment or in propagating, processing, marketing, freezing, canning, curing, storing, or distributing the above products or byproducts thereof; or (6) any employee employed in agriculture; or (7) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Administrator issued under section 14; or (8) any employee employed in connection with the publication of any weekly or semiweekly newspaper with a circulation of less than 3,000 the major part of which circulation is within the county where printed and published; or (9) any employee of a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, not included in other exemptions contained in this section; or (10) to any individual employed within the area of production (as defined by the Administrator) engaged in handling, packing, storing, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products.

It will be noted that the only confusing term in this section is the same term to which I have called your attention to—

Within the area of production as defined by the Administrator.

During the early part of this session of Congress, Mr. Andrews, the Administrator, wrote a letter to the Speaker of the House calling to his attention the necessity for amendments and at the same time submitted printed memorandum to the Labor Committee insisting upon amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, wherein he called to the attention of the committee the absolute need for clarification of the term "area of production" and in discussing this situation, and after recounting the various methods of attempting to arrive at a solution he stated the following, and I quote:

This procedure of investigation and redefinition for individual industries will not produce satisfactory results. In each instance it is clear that no amount of care or study can result in a definition of "area of production" which will not create a discriminatory situation.

The term "area of production" as used in section 7 (c) and section 13 (a) (10) is ambiguous and is subject to a great variety of possible interpretations. The term was used previously in the N. R. A. definition of "agriculture" and was the cause of great administrative difficulties at that time. It has had an even more disturbing history to date under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The difficulties of arriving at any approximate definition of what constitutes the "general vicinity" or "rural regions" are apparent. All of these considerations lead to the conclusion that any precise,

definite, uniformly applicable and at the same time equitable and justifiable definition of "area of production" as used in the act cannot be found. Its elimination or clarification of its meaning by the Congress therefore appears necessary.

Further quoting from Mr. Andrews' statement as follows:

No matter what approach might be used to define this area, material inequities would result.

He then turned his attention to certain contradictory terms used in section 7 (c) and 13 (a) (10) and referred to them as discriminations and with reference to the flexibility of hours he stated the following:

There is no question about this matter as nearly all farm products must be harvested quickly and as soon as harvested must be prepared for market immediately to prevent deterioration or reduced prices.

He stated emphatically that cotton ginning should be exempted without any limit of "area of production." He recommended changes with reference to industrial homework provision of the act in words as follows:

As the act is now written, it is extremely doubtful whether the wage and hour standards which it establishes can be enforced as to industrial homework. Under present practices in industrial homework industries, the Administrator is unable to secure proper records on the wages and hours of homeworkers.

He recommended that salaried employees drawing a monthly salary of \$200 per month be entirely exempted from the provisions, and I quote from him this language:

An amendment to exempt salaried workers who earn more than a stated salary each month will afford the Administrator more time to concentrate on the problem of raising the wages and improving the hours and other conditions of exploited workers.

He very definitely recommended the exemption of small telephone exchanges in the following term, a part of his statement being as follows:

An exemption for small telephone exchanges is necessary in order to insure uninterrupted telephone service for the farmers and for the small rural communities—small rural telephone companies on the whole are unable financially to comply to the wage provisions of the statute.

Further quoting from his statement:

Our figures indicate that the rate of return on the investment is only slightly affected if the exemption is set at 500 stations rather than 250 stations.

He then recommended what was termed a section to take care of "hot goods" which found their way into the hands of innocent purchasers, and upon that I quote from him as follows:

This amendment would provide administrative machinery to avoid hardship to innocent purchasers and would promote the free movement of goods.

He then recommended a section to deal with injunctions and venue. All of these suggested subjects are dealt with in H. R. 7133.

At the conclusion of his statement he estimated and gave figures for each agricultural operation set out in the sections previously quoted to wit: Section 7 (c) and 13 (a) (10), including cotton ginning, poultry, fresh fruits and vegetables, dairying, and so forth, showing a total of 1,037,315 engaged in those operations.

In his letter to the Speaker of the House he stated as follows:

There are approximately 1,000,000 employees who are affected by the exemptions from the maximum-hour requirements of the act in section 7 (c) or from both the wage and hour requirements in section 13 (a) (10).

In Administrator Andrews letter of July 15 to Hon. MARY T. NORTON, he showed a total affected under the present act of only 268,000 and yet showed a total affected by H. R. 7133 of 1,129,000, and as time went on he swelled this figure to approximately 2,000,000. When putting his own statement to the committee and to the Speaker of the House, he reported that there were only 1,000,000 engaged in the activities. The figures speak for themselves. H. R. 7133 does not exempt one single employee that Congress did not originally intend to exempt.

The great problem confronting the agricultural areas is not how many Mr. Andrews can take jurisdiction over but who is going to feed those who are thrown out of employment if the act is made to apply to something Congress never intended.

The agricultural people and farmers wonder how they can continue to exist facing an upward trend of cost of living and a downward trend of agricultural commodity prices. The agricultural prices today are less than 89 percent of pre-war prices, while they are paying for supplies and materials purchased 122 percent of pre-war prices.

Is it possible that the Administrator and his corps of young legal lights are more interested in power than they are in prosperity and peace among agricultural people?

The facts, conditions, and circumstances heretofore related caused the Labor Committee to set about in an attempt to clarify the Wage-Hour Act as it related to agriculture.

As a result of that effort the committee reported out H. R. 5435 by a vote of 16 to 2 and I happened to be one of those who voted in the affirmative. This bill did not include everything it should have included but it was better than no bill at all, and may I state here that not one single person representing agriculture was permitted to appear and testify before the committee, even though several requests were made for such privilege.

At the time the bill was reported out the chairman of the committee, Hon. MARY T. NORTON, was specifically directed by the committee and I quote "to employ every parliamentary procedure to secure its consideration by the House." The chairman did not request the Rules Committee to grant a rule but decided to ask the Speaker for recognition to place the bill before the House by suspension of rules, which requires a two-thirds vote and does not permit of any amendments. The matter was presented; the House refused to permit the bill to be considered in that manner.

Approximately 2 days after that, Administrator Andrews released to the press his first blast at the Norton bill. It then became very apparent that the chairman would not take any further steps to bring the bill to the floor of the House, and in fact told the committee that she would not take any further steps.

I did not believe that Congress had a right to leave this act in its present form wrapped around the neck of agriculture for another year when the Administrator himself said that it was unfair and incapable of fair administration. He had proven this to be true by issuing his famous "10-mile-circle area" rule throughout the country. He had, at that time, agriculture going around in enough circles without creating 10,000 new ones, but this apparently was of little concern to the Administrator or to the chairman of the Labor Committee—either because they did not know and understand agriculture or because they did not care. I prefer to be charitable and assign the first reason, for I quote the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, in a debate on the floor of the House on May 11, which statement is carried on page 5460 of the RECORD, when she said:

May I say, however, that I have never lived on a farm, so all of these operations on a farm are very difficult for me to understand. All my life has been spent in the city. I am not familiar with farming operations.

And to be equally as charitable to the distinguished Administrator and to illustrate his extensive knowledge and sympathy for agriculture—or should I say lack of?—I quote from his radio speech delivered by him over the National Broadcasting Co. red network on Monday, June 19, 1939, as follows:

When you think of a farm you probably have in mind a man who works 40 or 60 acres by the side of the road. He grows a little wheat and hay and corn and keeps a few cows and raises a few pigs and has an apple orchard and berry patch. He works his farm with the help of his wife and children and occasionally employs a hired man.

Are you surprised, Mr. Speaker, at agriculture, as we know it, being alarmed over its plight? Why he picked out 40

acres and left off the mule and added "he works his farm with the help of his wife and children" is astounding to say the least.

Could it be that Administrator Andrews is willing to see the women of the agricultural areas and children sweating their lives away on crops whose prices are to be further lowered by increased handling charges, which would inevitably mean more poverty, more mortgages, and more discomfort to a people who have fed this Nation far too cheaply?

If Mr. Andrews would be one-half as liberal with his interpretations of the act as it is now written as he has been in finding fault with everyone's proposal to aid agriculture, I am sure the situation would be much more bearable and pleasant. His definition of "area of production" is so absurd, unfair, and impracticable that the agricultural people of this country will not and cannot accept it.

The demand for the relief provided in H. R. 7133 is national in scope. In fact, there is considerable demand from the State of New Jersey, the home of our distinguished chairman of the Labor Committee. I desire to quote from a letter dated July 22, 1939, from Bridgeton, N. J., addressed to me, as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARDEN: The Cumberland County Board of Agriculture, an organization representing about 2,000 farmers in Cumberland County, N. J., which is an intensive truck-farming area, is deeply in sympathy with the provisions of your bill H. R. 7133.

We are contacting the New Jersey legislators in national legislation, prevailing on them to support you in your attempt to have this law enacted. We believe that your law will relieve many of the hardships now existing in the Fair Labor Standards Act and will also correct many of the illusions and other conditions occurring as a result of the definition on "area of production," as released by Administrator Andrews.

This letter is signed by Newlin B. Watson, secretary to the Cumberland County Board of Agriculture, which, I am informed, consists of a very representative group of agricultural people.

It has been very difficult and at times unpleasant to stand by and see the Administrator abandon some of the amendments contained in my bill H. R. 7133, because certain pressure groups had done him a favor, and embrace other provisions of the bill privately when seeking appropriations for his department, and publicly denouncing the amendments as he did in the case with reference to rural handicraft. To further clarify this the first case mentioned was where he abandoned the white-collar amendment for reasons not acceptable to men accustomed to fighting for a principle. The second instance is in his letter to Chairman NORTON. He had this to say with reference to the home-work amendment carried in my bill and exactly the same as the amendment carried in Mrs. NORTON's bill. I quote:

The proposed amendment runs contrary to the experience of many years but would actually require a Federal agency to sponsor the transfer of workers from the factory to the home.

And yet before the subappropriation committee when the third deficiency bill was being prepared the following colloquy took place between the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman TARVER, and the Administrator:

Congressman TARVER. That bill (the Norton bill) included a provision vesting in you certain discriminations with regard to rural handicraft?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Congressman TARVER. That provision also met with your approval?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; as I stated a few minutes ago, I did not oppose that.

These illustrations, together with hundreds of others of similar character, led me to the very definite conclusion that the Administrator of the wage and hour law should be spoken to or should be given a law to enforce with clear, definite, and unequivocal terms to prevent not only his astounding changes of mind, but to enable those engaged in agriculture to know what the law is and what to expect all the time without having to call the Administrator over long-distance phone every Monday morning to find out what the law will be for that week.

Agriculture is united in its support of H. R. 7133. The exemptions contained therein are not new. They are practically the same exemptions set out in the law previously quoted to me, but they are clearly and definitely set out in no mistakable terms in H. R. 7133. I am constrained to believe and feel that the facts and circumstances will support the assertion that it is the Administrator's intention to absolutely sabotage and destroy the exemptions heretofore granted agriculture by a subterfuge; to-wit, an unreasonable construction of the term "area of production"; hence, his unwillingness to let my bill, H. R. 7133 and H. R. 5435 (the Norton bill), or any other similar bill come to the floor for consideration by Congress.

If the law is as bad as he says it is why should anything cause him to change his mind and want to keep agriculture hamstrung, so to speak. The reason assigned by him, to-wit, that the act would be destroyed, is untenable and highly improper coming from the Administrator, in view of the fact that he is a creature of Congress and Congress consists of Representatives elected directly by the people, and sincerely having their interest at heart.

H. R. 7133 does not affect industrial labor as we have always understood it but the propaganda which has been disseminated by the publicity department of the wage-hour division has been of such a character as to have a tendency to arouse, stir-up, and begin a fight between agriculture and labor, which is certainly not to be desired or encouraged by any American citizens.

Agricultural labor and agriculture in general are entitled to a living wage and a fair return for their labor; so is industrial labor. Upon that question no one would differ with me. I am just as anxious as anyone to see the living conditions, standards, and wages of industrial labor raised, and I entertain the same fond hope for agriculture and agricultural labor, but unfortunately under the present set-up, increase in cost of production, and handling of agricultural commodities covered in H. R. 7133 simply means a further reduction of the already too small return to the farmer. The farmers want to pay good prices and at the same time want some comforts of this life for themselves, their wives, and children; but this they are being denied. Every agricultural commodity shipped to the market goes there with a tag attached—how much will you give me for these vegetables, these hogs, and so forth? But every piece of machinery, cloth, supplies, and material that goes to the farmer goes to him with a tag attached with a fixed price, and he either pays that price or he does not get the goods. For example, hogs are now selling in my district for approximately 5½ cents per pound; and that is all the farmer gets, whether it cost him 5 cents per pound to produce that hog or 10 cents per pound. Potatoes have just been selling for less than \$1 per hundred pounds, and that was all the farmer received, whether those potatoes cost him \$1 or \$3 to produce them. Every increase in cost in handling charges means that the farmer gets just that much less.

This discussion could very easily go on for hours, and many good reasons not already assigned could be given justifying the passage of H. R. 7133, but neither time nor space will permit. I therefore must conclude by saying that, so far as I have been able to learn, every agricultural organization in the United States is enthusiastically in favor of the passage of this legislation.

Many of those interested in other activities familiar with the terms of the bill regard it as highly desirable, and I regret exceedingly that the chairman of the Rules Committee saw fit to keep in his pocket the rule granted by the Rules Committee until it made it practically impossible to realize the passage of this bill during this session. However, it is my sincere belief that right will prevail and that agriculture will eventually realize the exemptions originally granted by Congress. [Applause.]

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the amendment that was defeated yesterday providing funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, I want to say that today I have received the greatest number of telegrams I have received with respect to any legislation. I have received over 500 telegrams from individuals and also from banks, commercial clubs, and other civic organizations in the State, together with farmers asking for a reconsideration of that measure. I speak of this matter now because it is going to conference and will come up again.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has received any messages from any dairymen in the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. I have not dissected the number of farmers that have sent telegrams to know whether they are dairymen or not, but I do not believe the unselfish dairymen of the United States are opposed to this legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Banks Business College;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Okie May Pegley;

H. R. 1693. An act to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood at or near Bean Lake in Platte County, and Sugar Lake in Buchanan County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of George Slade;

H. R. 2752. An act to include within the Kaniksu National Forest certain lands owned or in course of acquisition by the United States;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3104. An act for the relief of Kyle Blair;

H. R. 3224. An act creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 3375. An act to authorize M. H. Gildow to construct a free, movable, pontoon footbridge across Muskingum River Canal at or near Beverly, Ohio;

H. R. 3409. An act to amend the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1516), authorizing the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents and employees of the Indian Service;

H. R. 4260. An act for the relief of J. Milton Sweney;

H. R. 4322. An act giving clerks in the Railway Mail Service the benefit of holiday known as Armistice Day;

H. R. 4938. An act to amend the act approved June 26, 1935, entitled "An act to create a national memorial military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4998. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921;

H. R. 5625. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5747. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest;

H. R. 6049. An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa;

H. R. 6353. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6435. An act to authorize cancelation of deportation in the case of Louise Wohl;

H. R. 6475. An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6479. An act amending section 2857 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 6546. An act for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser;

H. R. 6556. An act to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6614. An act to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act;

H. R. 6634. An act amending previous flood-control acts, and authorizing certain preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6664. An act to admit the American-owned barges *Prari* and *Palpa* to American registry and to permit their use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 6747. An act relating to the retirement of employees to whom the provisions of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 763), as amended, apply;

H. R. 6874. An act to repeal section 4897 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 38) and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78);

H. R. 6878. An act to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37);

H. R. 7089. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Howard Hughes in recognition of his achievements in advancing the science of aviation;

H. R. 7090. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 481);

H. R. 7091. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 464); and

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to establish the Major General William Jenkins Worth Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. William Jenkins Worth.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and other public purposes;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kee;

S. 882. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders;

S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938";

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Anna H. Rosa;

S. 1899. An act to provide for the detail of a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service to serve as Assistant to the Surgeon General;

S. 1989. An act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the

apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes;

S. 2133. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Nevada;

S. 2239. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair, G. F. Allen, and Earl Wooldridge;

S. 2427. An act authorizing the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr.;

S. 2478. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 2697. An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad;

S. 2893. An act to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter;

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an international exhibition of polar exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940, and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Banks Business College;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Okie May Fegley;

H. R. 1693. An act to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood at or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, and Sugar Lake, in Buchanan County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of George Slade;

H. R. 2752. An act to include within the Kaniksu National Forest certain lands owned or in course of acquisition by the United States;

H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3104. An act for the relief of Kyle Blair;

H. R. 3224. An act creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 3375. An act to authorize M. H. Gildow to construct a free movable, pontoon footbridge across Muskingum River Canal at or near Beverly, Ohio;

H. R. 3409. An act to amend the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1516), authorizing the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents and employees of the Indian Service;

H. R. 4260. An act for the relief of J. Milton Sweney;

H. R. 4322. An act giving clerks in the Railway Mail Service the benefit of holiday known as Armistice Day;

H. R. 4938. An act to amend the act approved June 26, 1935, entitled "An act to create a national memorial military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4998. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921;

H. R. 5625. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5747. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest;

H. R. 6049. An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa;

H. R. 6353. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6435. An act to authorize cancelation of deportation in the case of Louise Wohl;

H. R. 6475. An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6479. An act amending section 2857 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 6546. An act for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser;

H. R. 6556. An act to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6614. An act to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act;

H. R. 6634. An act amending previous flood-control acts, and authorizing certain preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6664. An act to admit the American-owned barges *Prari* and *Palpa* to American registry and to permit their use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 6747. An act relating to the retirement of employees to whom the provisions of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 33, sec. 763), as amended, apply;

H. R. 6874. An act to repeal section 4897 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 38), and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78);

H. R. 6878. An act to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37);

H. R. 7089. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Howard Hughes in recognition of his achievements in advancing the science of aviation;

H. R. 7090. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 46, sec. 481);

H. R. 7091. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 46, sec. 464); and

H. J. Res. 283. Joint Resolution to establish the Major General William Jenkins Worth Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. William Jenkins Worth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, at 6 o'clock p. m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, August 5, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1061. Under clause 2 of rule XXVI a letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 288. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed additional copies of the hearings on the "Proposed amendments to the present neutrality law and related legislation affecting the foreign policy of the United States"; (Rept. No. 1454). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 375. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 285. Resolution providing for expenses in House Resolution 284 (Rept. No. 1456). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4366. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of United States against Doheny Executors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1036. An act to authorize the purchase of certain lands adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Agency in the State of North Dakota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 6635. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1461). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 1708. An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act (Rept. No. 1463). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 1998. An act for the relief of Ernestine Huber Neuheller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee of conference. S. 2271. An act for the relief of Barnet Warren (Rept. No. 1462). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 7501. A bill to permit the entry into the United States of Canadian-born American Indians who are wives of

citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 7502. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of certain rivers and their tributaries on the Island of Puerto Rico for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 7503. A bill appropriating \$96,000,000 to be invested in advertising for the furtherance of prosperity, the economic improvement and the general welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7504. A bill to control monopoly and to encourage and protect commerce among the States in order to assure continuous economic prosperity and security, increase the national income, and promote adequate and ever-rising standards of living limited only by the productive capacity and natural resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 7505. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for extending aid to producers of lumber and manufactured timber products; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 7506. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and tariff rates imposed on imported peppermint oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 7507. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell the old Brightwood School to the duly authorized representative of the Church of the Nativity of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 7508. A bill to create a Commission directed and authorized to collect or refund all debts or obligations now in default of foreign governments held by the United States of America, any department or agency thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 7509. A bill for the relief of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7510. A bill to provide that State employees employed in connection with programs carried on with the assistance of the Federal Government be selected in accordance with a nonpolitical civil-service plan; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 7521. A bill to protect the financial stability of the Federal Government by limiting interest payments on the public debt and by providing for the liquidation of the outstanding indebtedness of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7522 (by request). A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to dependents of veterans of the World War whose death is due to service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7523. A bill for the payment of full disability compensation to persons who are retired from Government service for disability and who are entitled to veterans' preference; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 7524. A bill to provide for research into dirigible construction for the purpose of determining the feasibility of using dirigibles for commercial overseas services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7525. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 29, 1935," approved June 24, 1937, known as the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7526. A bill imposing a tax on the retail sale of motor-vehicle fuel in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution providing that the United States should maintain a policy of strict neutrality in Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 294. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct an investigation in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 295. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7511. A bill to provide for the promotion of the emergency officers' retired list of the late Royal C. Johnson; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 7512. A bill for the relief of Edmund M. Lawhead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. R. 7513. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana to determine the claim of Salome D. Sevier, of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 7514. A bill for the relief of W. J. Gastinger and Joseph R. Peller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7515. A bill for the relief of Joseph B. Rupinski and Maria Zofia Rupinski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 7516. A bill for the relief of Annie Lanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7517. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7518. A bill for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7519. A bill authorizing and directing the Railroad Retirement Board to pay an annuity to Mrs. S. N. Alford, the widow of Samuel Naaman Alford, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 7520. A bill for the relief of Douglas C. Pyle; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5215. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Spencer B. Smith and 15 other residents of Mexico, N. Y., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in radio and press; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5216. Also, petition of Charles P. Wright, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5217. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, N. Y., to the Secretary of State, protesting against the shipping to Japan either the munitions of war or other commodities convertible into the munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5218. Also, petition of Fred Cunningham, of Oswego, N. Y., and 29 others, asking for enactment of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5219. By Mr. GEYER of California: Petition of Florence Thompson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5220. Also, petition of R. L. Dalager, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 125 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5221. Also, petition of Marie L. Kinney, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5222. Also, petition of Joe Casellos, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed, insofar as it affects emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5223. Also, petition of Gustave Albrecht, of Pasadena, Calif., and 15 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5224. Also, petition of W. H. Dickinson, of Pasadena, Calif., and 20 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5225. Also, petition of Marcus Z. Lytle, of Glendale, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5226. Also, petition of Grace Lovejoy, of Burbank, Calif., and 250 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5226½. Also, petition of Eva Jernigan, of Glendale, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5227. Also, petition of Sidney J. Fraser, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5228. Also, petition of Ralph Lovejoy, of Burbank, Calif., and 100 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief

bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5229. Also, petition of Juanita A. Cummings, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5230. Also, petition of A. N. Sandover, of Azusa, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5231. Also, petition of Sarah E. Nims, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 50 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against the liberal provisions of the relief bill, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5232. Also, petition of Helen B. Paulsen, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 25 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5233. Also, petition of Theodore W. Shafer, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 50 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency educational programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5234. Also, petition of Louis Kaminsky, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who voted against those provisions, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5235. Also, petition of Margaret A. Martin, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5236. Also, petition of Zetta Bricker, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 75 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5237. Also, petition of Florance Venice, of Hollywood, Calif., and 125 others, commending those Congressmen who voted for the liberal provisions of the relief bill and condemning those who opposed them, insofar as it affects the emergency education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

*5238. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of several thousand residents of San Francisco, to amend the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5239. By Mr. HILL: Petition of 266 citizens of Prosser and Pasco, Wash., respectfully urging the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5240. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition containing the signatures of many residents of Los Angeles, urging the Congress to consider changes in the Wagner Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5241. By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON: Petition of Paul Mikulin, of Dime Box, Tex., and 118 others, favoring enactment of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5242. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Filipino Nationals' Council of New York, urging enactment of House bill 7239; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5243. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, representing 6,000 workers, opposing all proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5244. Also, petition of J. Corrado, president, Shirt Cutters and Shipping Clerks Union, opposing proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5245. Also, petition of Alex Cohen, manager, New York Joint Board Shirt Makers Union, opposing all proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5246. Also, petition of the New York State Industrial Union Council, of New York City, representing 700,000, unanimously endorsing House bill 2888; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5247. Also, petition of H. Schwartz, president, Shirt Makers' Union, opposing proposed amendments to the Wage and Hour Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5248. Also, petition of the Cleaners and Dyers' Union, Local No. 239, A. C. W. of A., urging defeat of all proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5249. Also, petition of the Laundry Workers' Joint Board of Greater New York, representing 30,000 members, opposing all proposed amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5250. Also, petition of 109 Works Progress Administration teachers of Commerce High School, protesting against the Woodrum Act, and urging enactment of pending amendments thereto; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5251. Also, petition of Clark Perry, chairman, legislative committee, Plumbers' Union No. 463, representing 2,500 members, urging immediate enactment of Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Labor.

5252. Petition of Ichabod T. Williams & Sons, protesting against the provisions of the Barden bill (H. R. 7133); to the Committee on Labor.

5253. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York State Industrial Union Council, New York City, concerning House bill 2888; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5254. Also, petition of Alex Cohen, manager, New York Joint Board Shirt Makers Union, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5255. Also, petition of H. Schwartz, president, Shirt Makers Union, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the wage and hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

5256. Also petition of the Cleaners and Dyers Union, Local 239, A. C. W. of A., New York, concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5257. Also, petition of J. Corrado, president, Shirt Cutters and Shipping Clerks Union, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5258. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Washable Clothing, Sportswear and Novelty Workers Local 169, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5259. By Mr. LARRABEE: Petition of A. F. R. Hostetler, W. B. Adams, and 29 others, of Anderson, Ind., memorializing Congress to enact House bill 5620, the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5260. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of William H. Wait and numerous other Work Projects Administration workers, of Jackson, Mich., urging adequate appropriations for Michigan Work Projects Administration projects to relieve growing unemployment in the State; cancellation of the enforced 30-day lay-off for Work Projects Administration workers who have been employed 18 months; cancellation of provision requiring local communities to raise 25 percent of the cost of future Work Projects Administration projects; and reinstatement of the prevailing wage scale on all Work Projects Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5261. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by R. H. Lewis and 14 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enact-

ment of House bill 11, the improved General Welfare Act, as perfected by the House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5262. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 8 of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act quickly in the consideration and enactment of proper legislation which will tend to ameliorate the existing crisis in the railroad industry and contribute to the solution of the national railroad problem; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5263. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of H. S. Rorie and 375 other farmers of Delta County, Tex., favoring House bill 193, providing for the payment of the 1935-36 cotton certificates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5264. By Mr. POAGE: Petition of L. J. Robertson and 30 other cities, of Waco, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5265. Also, petition of C. B. Thomas and 23 other citizens of Waco, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5266. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Alex Cohen, manager, New York Joint Board Shirt Makers Union, New York City, concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5267. Also, petition of J. Corrado, president, Shirt Cutters and Shipping Clerks Union, New York City, concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5268. Also, petition of H. Schwartz, president, Shirt Makers Union, New York, concerning the wage and hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

5269. Also, petition of the Cleaners and Dyers Local 239, A. C. W. of A., New York City, concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5270. Also, petition of the Greater New York Joint Board, Textile Workers Union of America, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the wage and hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

5271. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York City, concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5272. Also, petition of Cary D. Waters, president, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 6635; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5273. Also, petition of the New York State Industrial Union Council, New York City, concerning House bill 2888; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5274. By Mr. SANDAGER: Memorial of the Board of Aldermen, Newport, R. I., opposing the removal of the U. S. S. *Constellation* from Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5275. By Mr. SECCOMBE: Petition of Mrs. F. O. Todd and members of the Alliance Garden Club, of Alliance, Ohio, urging the Ways and Means Committee to make permanent the earmarking of the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition for the purpose set forth in the Pittman-Robertson Act instead of limiting it to 2 years; also urging the enactment of the Mundt bill (H. R. 6723) regarding stream pollution, and opposing the Barkley bill for the same purpose; and urging the enactment of House bill 6321; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5276. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of sundry residents of El Paso, Tex., requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5277. Mr. THOMAS of Texas: Petitions of J. E. Adams, president, Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local Union No. 367; C. M. Baker, business agent, Local No. 4, Boilermakers; James R. Connell; G. W. Brown; R. B. Crawford, secretary and treasurer, Local No. 367, Truck Drivers and Helpers Local Union; L. A. Galloway, president, Millmen, Local No. 724; R. H. Jett; Rene W. Schroeder, secretary, Sheetmetal Workers, Local No. 54; May E. Morgan; C. P. Robertson; C. F. Davis; G. C. Fairfield; Wm. H. Geibig; Earl Williams, business representative, Furniture Workers Federal Labor Union No. 19766; Elizabeth White; Leslie Spangler;

Ralph C. Leader; Hy. Meineke, all of Houston, Tex., in behalf of House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5278. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry, "The Father of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 2, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, we humbly beseech Thee for the United States of America; that Thou wouldst be pleased to prosper it with all truth, in all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it; where it is in error, direct it; where in anything it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, establish it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite it; for the sake of Him who died and rose again, even Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, August 4, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lodge	Shipstead
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Smith
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Stewart
Austin	George	McCarran	Taft
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bankhead	Gibson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Guffey	Miller	Townsend
Borah	Gurney	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hayden	Pepper	Wagner
Capper	Herring	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Russell	White
Clark, Mo.	King	Schwartz	
Connally	La Follette	Schwellenbach	
Danaher	Lee	Sheppard	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one

of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 3, 1939:

S. 2065. An act to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes; and

S. 2666. An act providing for the exchange of certain park lands at the northern boundary of Piney Branch Parkway, near Argyle Terrace, for other lands more suitable for the use and development of Piney Branch Parkway.

On August 4, 1939:

S. 281. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930;

S. 522. An act to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 75 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes;

S. 683. An act for the relief of Fae Banas;

S. 755. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation;

S. 1322. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair Hester, daughter of E. R. Hester;

S. 1558. An act to provide for the acceptance of an easement with respect to certain lands in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1722. An act for the relief of Hannis Hoven;

S. 1773. An act to provide that no statute of limitations shall apply to offenses punishable by death; and

S. 1882. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Ross.

TAX EXEMPTION—AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 127)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2139, an act "To exempt from taxation certain property of the American Friends Service Committee, a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of Pennsylvania for religious, educational, and social-service purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to exempt from taxation the property situated in square 153, in the District of Columbia, described as lot 804, being 1708 New Hampshire Avenue Northwest, which property is used as a residence for students attending educational institutions in the District of Columbia.

In recommending disapproval of the bill, the President of the Board of Commissioners raises a number of fundamental objections. The basic theory upon which exemption from taxation is granted certain institutions is that the exempted institutions perform work which might otherwise have to be carried on by the Government at the expense of the taxpayers and conversely that the exemption of such institutions contributes to the continuance of their work, thereby materially lessening the burden upon the taxpayer. In the instant case, the exemption of this property from taxation would increase the tax burden on other residents of the District of Columbia, since the use of the premises as living quarters for students of different nationalities, 50 percent of whom are reported as Americans, does not in any sense relieve the local government of any definable public burden. As a matter of fact, such exemption would unfairly discriminate against and create a precedent for similar demands from numerous other university organizations, fraternal and otherwise, which provide living quarters for students in the District of Columbia.